

AMERICA

A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

VOL. XLVIII, No. 15
WHOLE No. 1216

January 14, 1933

PRICE 10 CENTS
\$4.00 A YEAR

CONTENTS

CHRONICLE	345-348
EDITORIALS	
Social Trends—The "Lame Duck" Amend- ment—Municipal Reform—The Perils of Beer —Technocracy and Human Nature—The De- generate Stage	349-351
TOPICS OF INTEREST	
Catholic Scientists' Round Table—Some of Youth's Virtues—Confession of Faith—The Spirit of Modern Germany.....	352-357
WITH SCRIP AND STAFF.....	357-359
SOCIOLOGY	
The Share the Work Plan.....	359-360
EDUCATION	
The Teaching Brothers in Our Schools.....	360-362
POETRY	
Fragmentary—Your Garden	362
BACK OF BUSINESS	362
DRAMATICS	
Stage Diction, Good and Bad.....	363-364
REVIEWS	365-367
COMMUNICATIONS	367-368

Chronicle

Home News.—In view of the President-elect's opposition to a general manufacturers' sales tax, which was advocated by President Hoover, legislation designed to balance the budget was held up until after a conference which Mr. Roosevelt had with Democratic Congressional leaders in New York City on January 5. Senator Borah's announcement, on January 3, that he planned to introduce legislation to cause expansion of the currency, thereby reducing the value of the dollar, brought about a European raid on the dollar comparable to the one last Spring. On January 4, the Senate Manufactures Committee began hearings on the Costigan-LaFollette \$500,000,000 unemployment-relief bill. The Senate Judiciary Committee conducted its investigation of the Collier Beer bill on January 7, the hearing being limited to that day.—The House Agricultural Committee, on January 3, by a vote of fourteen to eight, favorably reported the Jones "parity-plan" bill, which would endeavor to restore agricultural purchasing power by providing benefits to the producers of wheat, cotton, hogs, and tobacco to give these commodities a purchasing power equivalent to their pre-War purchasing power.

On January 3, President Hoover took issue with Democratic Congressional leaders who planned to halt his plans for Governmental reorganization by transferring the task to Mr. Roosevelt, which the President termed a device to defeat the reorganization; and that if there was ever to be any reorganization, Congress must keep its hands off now, or give Mr. Roosevelt much larger powers of independent action. The Philippine Independence bill was sent to the President after the conference report (changing the trial period to ten years) was approved by the Senate and the House. Secretary Hurley was strongly opposed to the bill, and it was predicted that a Presidential veto would be forthcoming.—President-elect Roosevelt planned to leave New York City for Warm Springs, Ga., on January 19, on the way visiting Muscle Shoals with Senator Norris, the chief protagonist for Government operation of the Shoals plant, and other Senators and experts.

On January 1, the President's Research Committee on Social Trends reported on its three-year survey of social conditions in the United States and suggested an organization, including scientific, educational, Governmental, and economic representatives, to consider the basic social problems of the nation. The report warned that unless there could be a more impressive fusing of social purposes than is revealed by present trends, there could be no assurance that violent revolution and dark periods of serious repression of liberty and democracy can be averted. Many of the problems of modern society were stated to be the result of the churches and the family declining in social significance, while economic and Governmental institutions rise.

On January 5, ex-President Calvin Coolidge died in his sleep. Since leaving the Presidency, Mr. Coolidge had lived in semi-retirement at Northampton, Mass., but had exercised considerable influence, privately in his own party and publicly through his writings. He was sixty years old, and had risen to the Presidency from being Governor of Massachusetts and later Vice President at the time of the death of President Harding.

Bolivia.—On January 2, a strong Bolivian force dislodged the Paraguayans from Fort Corrales in a hard-fought six-hour battle. It was stated that the Paraguayans had fled in disorder with the Bolivians in pursuit. Corrales was the sixth fort the Bolivians captured since the new offensive began under the supreme command of Gen.

Report on
Social
Trends

Coolidge
Dies

Bolivians
Retake
Corrales

Hans Kundt. With the capture of Corrales, the belligerents held practically the same lines that they held six months ago.

Brazil.—The controversy between Colombia and Peru over the town of Leticia gathered momentum on December 30, when Brazil sent General Almerido de Moura and his entire military staff to Fort Tabatinga, which is but two miles from Leticia. This was considered a bad omen, since the Government had already sent four warships and three destroyers to Para at the mouth of the Amazon. Brazilian authorities, however, announced that these precautions were merely to assure the neutrality of their country in the event of war between Colombia and Peru.

Bulgaria.—Warfare between the two chief factions of Macedonian revolutionaries led to further commotion. Two youths, under orders from the Protogeroff faction, shot Simeon Eftimoff, a newspaper editor of the Michailoff party, before the royal palace in Sofia on December 28. Innocent spectators were injured, one killed. On January 4, one of the assassins was shot to death in his hospital bed by his Macedonian nurse, who stated that she was under orders from the Michailoff faction.

Chile.—At the opening session of Congress on December 27 President Alessandri declared that Chile would not repudiate its \$750,000,000 foreign debt but would do its best to resume service in gold at the earliest opportunity. The President's emphatic declaration that he would restore the fair name of Chile among foreign creditors was cheered by Deputies and Senators.—To facilitate the funding of domestic and external debts a new amortization bureau was created.

Colombia.—Latest reports on the Leticia dispute stated that Colombia refused to listen to the reconciliation proposals from the neutrals and had decided to press on with the expedition to regain the territory seized by the Peruvians on September 1. It was stated that Colombia had placed troops and warships along the Putumayo River, forming a line that extended from Port Arthur near the Brazilian frontier, to Cauca in the west.

Czechoslovakia.—In contrast with the perturbed condition of the other countries of Eastern Europe, Czechoslovakia presented a relatively stable economic appearance at the close of the year. A slight improvement in exports was seen in September. The Governmental budget was considerably hampered by the difficulty of collecting taxes, arrears having accumulated up to some 7,000,000,000 crowns. Bureaucratic methods and political intrigues were blamed for much of the difficulty.

France.—On December 30, the Senate approved a measure to guarantee a \$14,000,000 loan to Austria. The Chamber had voted the loan on the preceding day. Replying to the obvious objection that a nation which had defaulted on its \$20,000,000 debt instalment to the United States, a former ally, should not be lending almost the same sum to a former enemy, Senator Bérenger claimed that no paradox existed, since his government had not "definitely" refused to pay the United States. M. Flaudin, former Minister of Finance, speaking in the Chamber on the previous day, charged that the loan was really for reconstruction of the Creditanstalt Bank by French and other capital. Parliament adjourned until January 10 as soon as the loan had been approved.—Reports of plans for an Italian-Albanian economic union aroused great concern in Paris; observers saw in the proposed union a threat to the peace of the Adriatic and of Europe.

Germany.—The amnesty granted to political prisoners by President von Hindenburg through the new Chancellor so that the men might be home for Christmas did much to spread the spirit of peace throughout Germany during the period of the truce which ended on January 1. Thousands who had been arrested in political brawls and riots were released.

On January 1, President von Hindenburg, in his eighty-fifth year, displayed vigor and hopefulness in receiving representatives of the diplomatic corps and departments of the Government. Msgr. Cesare Orsenigo, Papal Nuncio, as dean of the diplomatic corps presented the felicitations of foreign countries. The President responded by affirming that "the international crisis can be overcome only when mutual confidence, the foundation of all international relations, is restored." In answering Chancellor von Schleicher, who spoke for the Cabinet, the President stressed the improvement in international relations, rejoicing in the elimination of reparations and the recognition of Germany's right to equality. The good wishes of the Reichstag were presented by Third Vice-President Paul Loebe, of the Socialist party, acting in place of President Hermann Wilhelm Goering, who deliberately absented himself from the ceremonies. As Captain Goering was one of the strongest leaders of the Nazis, this act was interpreted as a signal for open opposition to the Chancellor when the Reichstag reconvenes, probably on January 17.

The Nazis took up the demands set forth by Dr. Alfred Hugenberg, leader of the Nationalists, in an interview with American newspaper correspondents before the holidays. In Hitler's paper, *Der Volkischer Beobachter*, Alfred Rosenberg, a propagandist for the Nazis, rejected their former declaration that all private debts should be held sacred and demanded that interest on Germany's loans be reduced, attacking all debts arising from the War or from loans granted after the War.—Bitter criticism

Austrian Loan

Precautions Taken

Gun Battles

Prisoners Released

New Year's Greetings

Debt Payments Pledged

Leticia Dispute

Economic Situation

Debt Revision

was being hurled at Hitler and the Nazis over the murder of one of the members of the Nazi storm troops in Dresden. On November 4, Herbert Hentzsch disappeared and nothing could be learned from the Nazis concerning him. Recently his body, mutilated and bullet riddled, was dragged from the Malter Dam reservoir. It was generally admitted that he had been put to death by fellow-Nazis.

The Reichsbank's gold supply continued to increase, chiefly from payments made by Russia, while the reserve in foreign currencies was decreasing. At the end of the year the ratio of reserve gold to outstanding notes was 25.8 per cent. The total amount of gold was given as 800,076,000 marks, which was nearly 11,000,000 marks above the low of last July.

Ireland.—Without the slightest previous intimation of his intention, President De Valera announced on January 3 the dissolution of the Dail, the holding of a general election on January 24, and the assembly of the new Dail on February 8. The decision was regarded as a shrewd political maneuver. Two recent developments evidently led President De Valera to hold elections at this time, less than a year since he took over the Government. The first of these was the effort being made to form a United National party in opposition to him. Senator Arthur Vincent made the appeal for such a party; the Lord Mayor of Dublin, Alfred Byrne, forwarded it by endeavoring to unite the professional and business men in it; former-President Cosgrave, who controlled the Cumann na nGaedheal, became the logical head of the new movement. The aim was to unite all the elements who desired economic peace with Great Britain. This new party had possibilities of strength if it developed. But it was in an inchoate stage when President De Valera announced the holding of a general election, and was unable to perfect its organization before the date set. The other development was the threat of the Labor party to withdraw its support of Fianna Fail unless the Government changed its proposal of reducing wages in the lower civil-service grades. Without the votes of the Labor party, the Fianna Fail Government lacked a majority. The Government made a slight compromise on the wage reduction which became effective on January 1, but this failed to satisfy William Norton, the Labor leader. President De Valera hoped, through a new election, to free his Government from dependence on the Labor support.

President De Valera went to the country with the frank avowal that the ultimate object of his policy was a severance of constitutional and political ties with Great Britain. He sought a mandate to carry on with greater vigor the policies his party has already inaugurated, the abolition of the oath, the refusal to pay the land annuities, the continuance of the tariff war, and a program for economic self-sufficiency. While Mr. Cosgrave's party and allies favored some modification of the oath and revision downwards of the land annuity payments, they demanded the

adoption of constitutional and recognized methods of negotiations with Great Britain. Their issue in the election was the ending of the tariff disputes with Great Britain and the drafting of new trading agreements.

Jugoslavia.—Anxiety concerning Italian policy continued. On January 2, the Yugoslav Minister in London called at the Foreign Office and gave official warning that his Government viewed with the gravest concern the situation being created by Italian policy in the Balkans. He was particularly concerned about a customs union which, it was asserted, Italy was trying to oblige Albania to accept as the price of a new loan. King Zog of Albania had refused to accept the loan.

Manchukuo.—On January 3, Japanese forces occupied Shanhaikwan after three terrific assaults. It was stated that the town was almost reduced to ruins and that the entire battalion of Chinese troops defending the city was slain. Shanhaikwan is a seaport town of Northern China, a few miles from the Eastern end of the great wall. The capture of this town was considered as a stepping-stone in a Japanese plan to unite Manchuria, Jehol, Inner Mongolia, and parts of China proper as far south as Peiping and Tientsin under Japanese domination.

Nicaragua.—On January 1, Dr. Juan B. Sacasa and Dr. Rodolfo Espinoza were inaugurated as President and Vice President. The inaugural exercises were followed by a procession to the Catholic Church, where a Te Deum was sung. The gathering then proceeded to the Presidential Palace. In his inaugural address Dr. Sacasa stated that the disturbing conditions in the northern departments and the withdrawal of the United States Marines were two major problems that confronted the new Government. On January 2, the evacuation of the United States Marines was completed when eighty officers and 815 men embarked at Corinto for home.

Poland.—Excitement ran high in Warsaw when, after a four-day trial of three Ukrainian revolutionists for an armed attack on the post office at Grodek on December 7, they were sentenced to death by the court at Lwow. Two of them were hanged, Wasyl Bilas and Evenyero Stanalepzyn. The sentence of the third, Marjan Zurawski, was commuted to sixteen years in prison.

Russia.—Two decrees issued by the Soviet Government reflected prevailing anxiety as to the labor and the food situation. A decree of December 28 ordered every citizen over sixteen years old to get a passport and instructed the militia, under the authority and direction of the OGPU, the secret police, to examine and verify the passport with the stated purpose of removing "useless"

Gold Supply

Elections Announced

Italian Policy

Japanese Take Shanhaikwan

Inauguration of President

Revolutionists Hanged

Party Policies

Citizens' Passports

mouths and surreptitious class enemies from the urban and industrial centers. The object was interpreted as that of anchoring labor to the factories, and preventing returns to the villages.

A decree of January 29 deprived housewives under the age of 56 of the cards which enabled them to purchase sugar and bread. In the category of housewives are included all healthy women not engaged in "socially useful" work. Thus, stated the Moscow press dispatches, more women would be brought into industrial occupations "with a view to ultimate abolition of the home as the unit of family life."

For the coming year there was predicted that nearly a million members of the Communist party "might be" deprived of their membership, thus reducing the total membership of 3,000,000 by one-third, and a corresponding number of persons to enjoy special food privileges. According to Mr. Duranty, Moscow correspondent of the *New York Times*, the term *kulak* was now extended to apply to "any peasant opposed to rural socialization," that is, enforced membership in the collective farms. Such "kulak" tendencies, involving corresponding measures of reprisal, were particularly rife in Ukrainia and the Lower Volga regions.—The report was current that Japan had formally rejected a non-aggression treaty with the Soviet Government.

South Africa.—All the efforts of the Government to keep South Africa on the gold standard failed, and on December 29 the country officially abandoned the gold standard. N. C. Havenga, Minister of Finance, according to the *New York Times* report, "estimated that between £2,000,000 and £3,000,000 had left the country in three days and had the run continued the banks would have been forced to close and other financial institutions would have been shaken." The security of the Nationalist Government of Premier J. B. M. Hertzog was greatly weakened, previously, by the campaign of the South African party under General Jan C. Smuts and the recent acquisition of Labor support. The re-entrance into politics, also, of Judge T. J. Roos, embarrassed Premier Hertzog. From one side it was thought that Judge Roos would force a coalition Government with Premier Hertzog; from another source it was stated that he would compel the resignation of the Government and enter into negotiations with General Smuts.

League of Nations.—Pierre Comert, creator of the League of Nations information section, of which he had been director for thirteen years, resigned from his position on December 26, to take effect January 1. His departure was ascribed to the unanimity rule, under which he could not placate the extreme German nationalists, who demanded his dismissal as their price for allowing Joseph Avenol to become secretary general. Arthur Sweetser,

of Boston, Mass., as M. Comert's deputy, would be acting director until June, 1933.

War Debts.—The anomalous situation created by France's non-payment of the December 15 instalment was recalled by various events at the turn of the year. Joseph Paul-Boncour, French Premier, broke established precedent by calling in person upon Mr. Edge, the American Ambassador in Paris. Mr. Edge, somewhat in a quandary, replied by a cordial handshake to the Premier at the French President's annual New Year's reception to diplomats. In the United States Senate, on January 4, a lively debate broke out concerning the French course of action, which was vigorously assailed by Senators Borah, Johnson, and Robinson. Mr. Borah accused President Hoover of seeking Congressional power to make a debt settlement, at the time of his conversations with ex-Premier Laval. Mr. Robinson stated that France had loaned to Austria since December 15 a sum "almost equivalent" to the amount that was then due to the United States.

Eastern Europe continued to present special problems. Greece, it is true, announced on December 30 that she would pay to the United States the sum of \$67,000, which would be thirty per cent of her instalment. On the other hand, as a complete reversal of the international picture, the nations of the Little Entente, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and Rumania, were informed, according to the *Prager Tageblatt*, that the great Powers would not live up to their previous obligation to make good the sums due to be paid into the general reparations fund, under the Hague agreement, from the Hungarian and Bulgarian optants. It will be recalled that this was the solution reached in this extremely vexed question after six years of dispute, that had prolonged the international reparations conferences.

During the week of January 22, the Paulists will celebrate the seventy-fifth anniversary of their founding. For this occasion the Editor will devote an article which will set forth the significance in American life of this typically American Society.

Hilaire Belloc, in "Your Duty to the Poor," basing his observations on the English situation, will say some very necessary things about Christian doctrine.

Technocracy is still so nebulous that it has been hard to find one capable of doing justice to that engineers' dream. Next week, John W. Burke, himself an engineer, will point out some of its virtues and defects.

Brother Cajetan, C.F.X., a previous contributor, has been interesting himself in ancient Irish masterpieces. Next week, he will tell of the beauty of the "Tain Bo Cualnge," perhaps the most wonderful saga.

AMERICA

A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

SATURDAY, JANUARY 14, 1933

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

WILFRID PARSONS
Editor-in-Chief
PAUL L. BLAKELY FRANCIS X. TALBOT JOHN LAFARGE
GERARD B. DONNELLY FLORENCE D. SULLIVAN JAMES F. DONOVAN
Associate Editors
FRANCIS P. LEBUFFE, Business Manager

SUBSCRIPTION POSTPAID
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 - - - - Europe, \$5.00

Addresses:
Publication Office, 461 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.
Telephone: MEEdallion 3-3082

Editors' Office, 329 West 108th Street, New York, N. Y.

CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW
Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

Social Trends

AFTER three years, President Hoover's "group of eminent scientists," appointed to survey social trends in the United States, have begun to report. Two large volumes have been published to embody the main findings; thirteen more will follow, giving in greater detail the facts upon which the findings rest. Last week, the committee released for the press an official summary of some 30,000 words in length.

The eminence of the investigators in their respective fields encourages us to hope for a mass of data of great value to the student of social science. Financed by the Rockefeller Foundation, and given a quasi-official position by the approbation of President Hoover, the investigators found all doors open to them. What they give in the form of statistics will be found, no doubt, to be authentic. Their conclusions from the data which they have gathered are matter for fair comment. It is not always easy to get the sheer facts. To collate these facts and so reach a legitimate conclusion is a much more difficult task.

The summary indicates that a philosophic interpretation of the trends of life in this country will fill the greater part of the report. This fact will at once warn the student to be on his guard. No matter how objective the investigators strive to be, it is inevitable that their interpretations will be colored by their own philosophy of life. It is rare that a committee investigating a problem of human import does not find itself obliged to offer a majority and a minority report. The most recent instance is the President's Committee on the Costs of Medical Care. After five years of investigation the committee presented a minority report which, if the *Journal of the American Medical Association* is to be credited, alone represents the views of the medical profession, as contrasted with those of the exploiters of the profession. Possibly the thirteen volumes yet to come from the pens of the eminent scientists praised by President Hoover will embody what are in effect minority reports.

This is not to say that Catholic students will not find the volumes immensely useful. Unlike the well-known technocrat who said that he had not read the Labor Encyclicals of Leo XIII and Pius XI because he had no interest whatever in anything a Pope might say, Catholic students think it advisable to study all aspects of the subject which they consider. But the summary, read in the light of the unfortunate fact that sociology in this country has been not a pagan but a godless sociology, indicates that the report has been made by men who do not know what is meant by religion, natural or revealed. Unless the volumes which follow correct the philosophy of the summary, we shall have in this much heralded report not much more than the mouse brought forth by the mountain.

The "Lame Duck" Amendment

THE something more than tart letter of the President, given to the press on January 4, once more emphasizes the necessity of a speedy adoption by the States of the "lame duck" Amendment. For many years, it has been obvious that the various bureaus and commissions at Washington, not to include for the moment the Departments, ought to be reorganized in the interest of economy and reasonable efficiency. Five years ago, Mr. Hoover was one of many who proposed plans for re-organization. The scheme went forward by fits and starts, and then went backward under a contrary impulse given it, the President claims, by recalcitrant Democrats.

The President now makes the direct charge that the Democrats are simply playing politics, with no thought of the fact that the cost of maintaining the bureaucracy is mounting daily. The Democrats, in his view, are maintaining conditions which no other Government would, "and no good Government," can, tolerate. Ultimately a change must be made, but the Democrats will make no change until they can act with a Democratic President in the White House, and with an overwhelming majority in Congress. No one doubts, the President argues, that when the change is made it will be the change which he recommended five years ago.

As the ascetics would say, the situation is not edifying. It is probable enough that the Democrats are merely marking time, and it is easy to understand why they have taken that course. It is also easy to understand that they are slightly unwilling to begin the new Administration with a scheme that promises to fend off thousands of hungry Democrats from the rich fodder supplied by the bureaucracy at Washington. Still, it is at least possible that the Hoover plan is not as perfect in their eyes as it is in the eyes of its fond father. Perhaps they have in view another plan which will make the Hoover policy look like a hydrocephalous monster. In any case, they are at perfect liberty to thwart and defy the President, leaving nothing undone to prove to their fellow-citizens that anything may happen as long as a Republican is in the White House.

The current quarrel between Congress and the President does not constitute a serious issue. It merely shows

what can happen should a serious issue present itself. Under the present Constitutional provisions a Congress returned by the country in November does not meet until thirteen months later. In the meantime, the old Congress is free to play ducks and drakes with the wishes of the people as expressed in the elections. The Amendment proposed by Senator Norris provides, among other changes, that the Congress elected in November shall take office in January. No good reason has been alleged against it. It should be adopted at once.

Municipal Reform

IN his inaugural address as Mayor of New York, the Hon. John P. O'Brien put his finger on a number of abuses common to practically every municipal government in this country. The Mayor proposes at the outset the abolition of five boards and commissions, and advises changes in the structure of many others. One advantage to be derived from these alterations is economy, and the Mayor laid down a good rule when he put on the heads of all departments the obligation "to prove to me the necessity of any appointment hereafter to be made." If the Mayor succeeds in making these reforms, and in enforcing his orders, he will have a successful, if stormy, tenure. But the city will enjoy a corresponding degree of prosperity.

Municipal government has been under fire for many years. In the 'seventies, Bryce expressed his mind with freedom, marveling that we Americans, in other respects so practical a people, were content to put up with extravagance and inefficiency in the government of our cities. Since Bryce's time, the "muckrakers" and other unbridled critics have expressed their minds with even greater freedom, but with insignificant results. Philadelphia is not our only city that is "corrupt and contented," as Steffens wrote a quarter of a century ago. The evil has struck so deep, that we have taken for granted that a city government, honest and effective in its every department, is an impossibility. Like David Harum's pup, every city government must have its fleas, if only to bar it from too much reflection on its low estate.

Reformers, and outraged citizens, have commonly been met with the defense that while things may be bad, the control of a city government must be "practical." The word generally means that the political bosses must be permitted to use the city's money to keep themselves in power. A party soon becomes a weak and impotent thing, unless the bosses, placed at strategic points, have a number of offices at their disposal, wherewith the party workers can be rewarded. As the number of workers demanding a reward increases, so too must the number of jobs be increased. Whether the city needs these workers is wholly immaterial. The average politician soon persuades himself that the city's money is not the money of the people, but the money of the first man who can attach it; legally, if possibly; by stealth and device should the law, stretched, pulled, exaggerated, and inflated, fail to cover the city's treasury. The ancient legend which

relates that the railroads used to employ one man to ascertain the good estate of the car wheels, at the end of a run, by tapping on them with a hammer, and another man to hear for the first, is probably without foundation. It would be true, however, if applied to the folly and criminality of many municipal governments in the United States.

The abolition of unnecessary offices is, of course, only one phase of the reform that must be made. Perhaps it is not the most important phase. Many cities are operating under narrow charters reluctantly granted by legislators from the rural districts, or under charters so liberal that waste and corruption are inevitable. These and all needed reforms will follow, as soon as upright and competent men can be induced to interest themselves in municipal politics. That, however, is a more unpleasant office than the work assigned to Hercules in the Augean stables. Have we Americans lost the power of self-government? If that question must be answered in the negative, or with a qualified and attenuated affirmative, how can we regain it?

The Perils of Beer

FOR some weeks the Senate has been considering the proposition of legalized beer. So remote are its learned members from the questions of the day that, in the words of the Democratic floor leader, they need more time for reflection. Prohibition, its enforcement or repeal, have been debated all over the country for thirteen years. No one has ever attempted to apply cloture. But the Senate still seeks light and information. Whatever charge can be made against that venerable body, precipitancy of action must be omitted from the most searching indictment.

As Congress debates, however, the bootleggers organize. Like a Democrat reading a Republican platform, they regard with apprehension, and view with alarm, the prospect of legalized beer. As honest business men, they resent the opening of breweries which, while paying a tax to the Government, can undersell them. That is nothing less than "muscling in" on their trade, and they are prepared to resent it, by fair means, if possible, but by any means, if necessary.

There is an amusing side to this resentment of the bootleggers, but when that resentment begins to work, there will be nothing to laugh about. The bootleggers and their allies are in deadly earnest as most men are when they have millions at stake. Legalized beer would destroy not only their capital, but their means of livelihood. This fact explains why no bootlegger looks on Bishop Cannon with anything but admiration and love. As long as the status quo for which the Prohibitionists are fighting can be maintained, the bootleggers are no less happy than the Bishop.

If and when beer is legalized, the forces of law and order will be severely taxed. Prohibition has taught many, who scorn the name of Prohibitionist, that anything not positively forbidden by statute is permissible, and that teaching breaks down self-control. Unless Congress finds

a better solution than at present it seems likely to find, we may look for lawless saloons in the next decade side by side with lawless speakeasies. The vices of the bootleggers will remain, while the vices of the low saloon will return, and both will unite to plague us. Both can be checked in time, but it will be long before the evil effects of the noble experiment can be washed away.

Technocracy and Human Nature

MOST of us are not quite sure that we understand what is meant by "technocracy." We are not certain that we grasp the facts, if facts they be, on which the proponents of the theory, if it is a theory, base their conclusions. But that ignorance and uncertainty do not debar us from talk and from speculation.

On the whole we are inclined to agree with Alfred E. Smith who, in the current issue of the *New Outlook* concludes that technocracy is "a pretty big order which is hardly substantiated by what follows." The gist of Mr. Smith's indictment, however, is that technocracy is too much out of keeping with human nature to be tolerated, or to be true.

That indictment appeals to our sense of what is right and proper. But is it "substantiated," to use Mr. Smith's terms? The world tolerates, and even approves, many things which are quite out of keeping with human nature. War, as the ordinary means of composing international differences, is one of them. Strikes, lockouts, and starvation wages, the normal concomitants of industry as it has long existed under the prevailing capitalistic system, form another. The machine age has been accompanied with disorders in every field of human activity. These disorders do not appear to be a necessary consequence of the increasing use of machinery; still, our best social and philosophic thought has been unable to devise a practicable means of suppressing them. If, then, the technocrats predict a tremendous rise in unemployment within a few years, resulting in starving millions, their predictions have a basis in the fact of past experience. They must "substantiate" the prediction if it is to gain intellectual acceptance, but it is not overthrown merely by suggesting a number of facts which, at least apparently, negative it.

To the extent that it will force us to examine seriously the possibility of correcting the evils which vitiate the relations of capital and labor, technocracy will assuredly do us a service. We need to be shaken out of our complacent attitude. Governor Smith is undoubtedly right when he says that a system which is not in harmony with the needs and demands of human nature ought to be rejected. That conclusion leads step by step to another.

The industrial and economic system which has prevailed in this country since the rise of the machine age, roughly a century ago, is certainly not consonant with the needs and demands of human nature. Every association and society, private or public, justifies itself only when it directly or indirectly aids man to attain the highest degree of perfection, natural and supernatural, of which he is capable. But under capitalism, as we have known it in America, "greed," to quote Pius XI, has infected

human society and the State. A remedy for the woes that afflict mankind, as Leo XIII wrote, must be found speedily. After forty years, we still seek it.

Can capitalism, in itself a system neither good nor bad, but indifferent, be reformed? Or have the evils attached themselves so firmly to the very fabric of the system that the attempt at radical excision must mean the destruction of the system itself? If so, what can be substituted for it? In our view, reform is difficult, but possible. The first steps to reform have been indicated by the November Catholic alumni conferences.

We do not know what may be brought forth by the further extension of the machine age, but we are confident that if men become more human, its evils can be averted. To become more human, essentially, means to recognize the weaknesses and the potentialities of our nature, to live according to the dictates implanted in that nature by its Creator, and in His Will to find our truest liberty. We are most truly men, and images of God, when we are charitable and just, foreseeing and intelligent, tolerant of what is less good in order that we may gradually ascend to that which is perfect. The application to life of the principles of the Gospel will not at once solve every difficulty. But it will point to the solution, and enable us to endure, until the solution has been grasped.

The Degenerate Stage

WHEN a clergyman or teacher criticizes the morals of the stage, he is usually told that he does not know what he is talking about. The moral conduct of actors, off and on, is better on an average, he will be informed, than that of teachers and the clergy. But when the criticism comes from the stage itself, the probabilities are that it is true.

In the *Billboard* for January 7, the editor offers the following considerations under the caption, "Shall We Rejoin the Ladies?" Once upon a time, the editor mourns, there were ladies on the stage, and ladies and gentlemen in the audience. But now

It is seldom that we see a lady depicted behind the footlights. Haridans, prostitutes, and wenches make up the female population of our plays, and even when someone with the status of a lady must be introduced, she is shown up as a fishwife—or, preferably, a strumpet. The stage has taken the aspect of a smoking room, and it is seldom enough now that gentility finds its place either behind or before the footlights.

The *Billboard* is a leader among trade papers, and is not given to exaggeration on its editorial page. Its criticism, which comes with authority, agrees with that which is entertained by civilized persons generally. Unfortunately, there are no groups or associations which are able to raise the stage from its low estate. "Equity" seems to be interested only in the financial welfare of its members.

Possibly reform will come from the outside. We gather from the *Billboard* that the stage is in financial straits, and the editor, perhaps unwillingly, gives one reason for this condition. Most men and women are fairly decent, but the stage is not. Conducted by degenerates for degenerates, it can appeal only to a small minority of the people. It has failed, because it deserves failure.

Catholic Scientists' Round Table

FRANCIS P. LeBUFFE, S.J.

THERE was much coming and going at Atlantic City during Christmas week, but the throng was an unusual one. Not giddy pleasure seekers, not wonted weekenders, but men and women who are used to hard work and careful thought, and who gathered to pool the findings that test tube and microscope, spectroscope and telescope, and all the other ample precision instruments of science had yielded since last year's meeting. It was the annual gathering of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Most of the meetings were heralded abroad, but one was not—and deliberately so. Nor was this silent unobtrusiveness born of any fear or false timidity, but rather of a sense of decorum and of a consciousness that ballyhoo and drum thrumming are quite often in inverse proportion to real worth.

This quietly gathered group calls itself the "Round Table of Catholic Scientists and Teachers of Science." It is the loosest of all organizations, for it has no officers—unless it be the permanent secretary, and untiring notice-server, Father Anselm M. Keefe, O.Praem., of St. Norbert's College. It "just meets," as some one has put it. And yet from "just meeting" a something very definite is happening. There is a growing consciousness of purpose, a sense of solidarity, a realization that scattered throughout this country are Catholic scientists—lay and cleric—in every field of factual knowledge. Many of them, it is true, are carrying a teaching load that offsets any chance for research; and they are making the sacrifice generously to meet the present needs of our Catholic high schools and colleges. But others rank on equal level with research workers outside the Church.

It was this round table that met for the fifth time on Wednesday, December 28, at the Marlboro-Blenheim for luncheon and subsequent discussion. From a group of six who met first in New York in 1928, the round table now has a mailing list of some three hundred. About thirty were present at the luncheon—a small group, but after all "precious things come small"—and on that particular Wednesday, Atlantic City, along with the other coastal towns, was doing its best to prove what "climate" can mean when it is in a tantrum. Dr. Hugh Taylor, of Princeton University, was the amiable host and chairman. The Rev. John T. Sheehan, O.S.A., welcomed the delegates in the name of His Excellency, the Most Rev. John Joseph McMahon, Bishop of Trenton.

A number of practical problems were discussed, some bearing on future plans which will be of wide importance and influence if they do finally eventuate.

But the outstanding contribution of the meeting was the address by Dr. Karl F. Herzfeld, Johns Hopkins University—"The Relation of Our Scientific Life to Our Religious Life." With his wonted modesty, this noted scientist, with all the precision of thought that a profes-

sional philosopher might well envy, developed the subject, calmly, dispassionately, and so entertainingly that it is little exaggeration to say that "one could have heard a pin drop" during the twenty-five minutes wherein he unfolded his subject. He questioned the bearing of scientific research on the scientist's religious life in its three-fold aspect: dogmatic, moral, and ascetic. A few brief quotations must suffice. Dealing with dogmatic religion he said:

As far as I can see, with a single exception, it is impossible on principle that there is any conflict between the results of scientific discovery and dogma as it stands now, or the teaching of the Scriptures. That follows from the fact that neither the Scriptures nor dogma teaches anything that is subject to scientific discovery.

The single exception is anthropology which is affected by the revelational datum of the descent of the human race from a single pair. Advancing from this question of the possible conflict between the immediate results of scientific research, Dr. Herzfeld discussed the bearing of scientific theories and of far larger generalizations often advanced by scientists. He skilfully pointed out that the conflict—if any—is due to unwarranted materialistic interpretations by scientists or to the fact that the scientific worker is abstracting from but not denying some data of Revelation. In both instances, prudence is demanded lest a warrantable scientific theory be attacked because it is unduly linked up with a false philosophy, or because it abstracts without denying.

His conclusion on the bearing of scientific research on the moral life of the scientist was gratifying:

There is very little to say about that, except that so far as everyday common acts are concerned, like veracity or diligence, the life of a scientist does not affect the moral life at all. It has dangers, far less than research in history, or literature, or the social sciences might involve. The scientist has not to deal with values, has not to judge social or moral questions. Scientific research might help because it should teach self-control and objectivity. In university life, as a whole, morality, compared to life in the business world, will be in a more ideal state, as the financial viewpoint is not at the center, and a certain modest financial security is present.

How splendidly true when one bethinks oneself of the temptations that come to the doctor, lawyer, banker, etc., to engage in wrong or even in "shady" practices!

Then for the ascetic life, i.e., the life of prayer of the scientist, Dr. Herzfeld again, with almost epigrammatic terseness, summed up:

It is quite true that active scientific research interferes with the ascetic life, as does every active intellectual pursuit; perhaps apart from theology. This interference is not due to any peculiarity of scientific activity. It is present in exactly the same way in the activity of an official of a large diocese, in the activity of the busy city pastor, or of a missionary. Anybody who chooses such a career must effect a compromise. And the same compromise must be effected by people choosing an active scientific career. . . . A man engaged in active research will think of it in and out of time; and even if he does not actively think of his field, his mind might feel too exhausted to be successful at medi-

tation. But again, in this respect, there is no difference between the research man and anyone of the actively engaged men in ecclesiastical positions mentioned above. And in the same way in which these persons are satisfied with the compromise for the sake of the importance of their office in the same way shall, and can, persons selecting the scientific career acquiesce in a similar arrangement.

Dr. John M. Cooper, whose fertile brain first conceived the idea of this round table—as it first conceived the “Catholic Anthropological Conference”—followed Dr. Herzfeld with a few brief remarks. “Anybody will stop to see two dogs fighting. But hundreds of non-fighting dogs will pass and none will take notice of them.” And so it is, he remarked, that when religion and science have a quarrel—as unfortunately has happened of late—every one is conscious of the fight. “But why not stress the millennium-old cooperation between science and religion?” Then, developing his theme, he indicated the large contribution of science along with religion in pushing back the domain of superstition—“superstition, the worst enemy of mankind which has destroyed more human beings than all the wars, famines, and pestilences combined.” Next he pointed out the cooperation between science and religion exemplified in every Catholic hospital.

Father Cooper made a further plea for an entente cordiale between science and religion by asking the theologian and apologist to refrain from asking the scientist to go beyond his facts. “In anthropology we can prove that at least ninety per cent of tribes known to us have a belief in a Supreme Being. We cannot prove it for the remaining small per cent.” But he stressed the fact that though a science, e.g., anthropology, as a factual study, may not be able to prove a position, theology may well be able to substantiate it.

Catholic scientists everywhere should be interested in this round table, and, to help that interest gather impetus, it might be of profit to quote from the “cardinal ideas” agreed upon at the 1928 meeting as embodying its policies:

1. The encouragement of productive scholarship as distinct from absorptive scholarship, by Catholics, particularly by Catholic colleges and universities in the field of natural sciences.

2. It would be wiser to form no elaborate or formal organization. . . . Each year there should be a meeting at the same time and place of the meeting of the A.A.A.S.

3. It was generally agreed that inasmuch as science in general, and scientific research in particular, are, as such, neutral as regards religious belief, the formation of a separate organized society of Catholic scientists would be superfluous, and, given the hazard of misinterpretation of its aims by Catholics and non-Catholics alike, apt to do more harm than good.

It was in accord with the second “idea” that resolutions were passed at Atlantic City to hold a round table at the special sessions of the A.A.A.S. to be held in Chicago in June, 1933, and the wonted round table at the regular meeting in Boston, Christmas week, 1933.

The Atlantic City round table lasted only a bare three-hour span, but even those who had come from afar for that single meeting and left for home immediately thereafter judged it well worth the expense and trouble. All concurred with Father Cooper’s hope that “like a snowball going down hill, it will gather mass and weight and momentum.”

Some of Youth’s Virtues

DANIEL A. LORD, S.J.

JUST because youth has been subjected to a terrific battering leveled at faith and morals, those who come through successfully, as thousands of our Catholic young men and women do, are superlatively fine. They have been tested and tried as few generations ever have been. They were strong, became stronger, and survived.

Perhaps no more striking proof of the character of Catholic young men and women can be found than their response to the appeal of Religious vocation. With the whole world singing its siren song, with opportunities advertised in every fashion, and pleasure made easy and accessible, vocations have advanced in seven-league leaps.

Every Religious Order in the country has felt this surge of the vocational ideal. The seminaries have experienced it in remarkable fashion. And this increase took place not during the years of the depression, but during the years when America was most prosperous and opportunity knocked in a regular tattoo at every man’s door.

While non-Catholic seminaries were complaining that vocations to the ministry were falling off in terrifying fashion, Catholic seminaries were crowded. The time is not far distant when in many dioceses, the priestly saturation point will be reached. Religious Orders have found their novitiates filled with high-type, well-prepared, generous young men. Scarcely a woman’s Order in the country has not seen the number of applicants increase. Religious vocations are now springing up in every section of the country; priestly vocations are multiplying everywhere.

While this growth has been notable, perhaps a stronger indication of the generosity of youth has been the response to the contemplative and missionary ideal. Recently I had occasion to reach a number of Carmelite convents by mail. Almost all of them had just about reached their allowed quota, with perhaps one or two vacancies. And the appeal of the missionary life has simply caught like spreading fire. Young men and young women from beautiful homes, with all of life opening before them, will sit during a retreat and talk with panting eagerness of their desire to go to a missionary Order. Real zeal and splendid generosity mark their attitude. They want to do hard things for Christ and souls.

Most priests with whom I have talked have the same experience that is mine: the parents are less generous with their children’s vocation than are the children themselves. In most cases of failing vocations, the son or daughter is not to blame; it is the father or mother who, with utmost selfishness and utter shortsightedness, stands between the child and an apostolic life.

In one particularly large school, thirty girls expressed in a single year the desire to enter Religious life. Four actually went. In every other case, parental opposition was so fierce and insistent that the daughter could not fight against it. When our little booklet “Shall I Be a Nun?” appeared, a number of Religious superiors wrote that the booklet needed was one addressed not to the daughters but to the ungenerous parents.

This single factor of vocations, plus their undoubted interest in missions and their response to the ideals set them by the Catholic Students' Mission Crusade, indicates a fundamental generosity on which we can heavily count.

This same spirit of generosity appears in their acceptance of an appeal like that of the Pope to Catholic Action. We of the elder generation have made one fundamental mistake where youth has been concerned: we have not dared to ask enough. We who have worked with them now know that they are disappointed because we have set low standards for them and made slight demands upon them. We have not begun to test the possibilities of youthful generosity. We have gauged it too low. We have asked too little from them for Christ.

Certainly no one questions the initiative of this younger generation. For many of them, initiative is centered upon their own affairs merely. But there is in every group a competent cluster of leaders whose abilities and resourcefulness can be called upon with a sense of assurance.

They can, if given a chance, run their year books, and want to. They are good editors of college and high-school papers. They are active managers of athletics. They handle the affairs of their clubs and societies in competent fashion. They do well in the executive work of Student Councils. They are, of course, appreciative of faculty help and supervision and really lean upon it and expect it. But it is a stupid faculty adviser who does not realize that there are young men and women in high school and college who can be trained to do splendid jobs in extra-curricular lines and who have initiative that needs not a curb but quiet and effective direction.

Along this particular line of youth's good qualities, there is no question that non-Catholic schools could, until very recent years, give us a great many important lessons. The mere suggestion of this opens up a huge new subject; but I am convinced that if we now complain of lacking Catholic lay leaders, the fault is not with the natural abilities and initiative of Catholic laymen and women. The fault lies with the older generation of priests, Religious, and parents, who persisted in doing all the work, curbing and curtailing the energies of youth, hand feeding a very competent generation, and killing the power to lead by keeping them constantly and most discouragingly in check reins and lead strings.

As one who has worked with young people in the classroom, student organizations, periodicals, musical societies, plays, pageants, conventions, and national movements, I am ready and willing to vouch for their willingness and spirit of self-reliant initiative. They need guidance. But in many cases what they have been given was not guidance but repression and suppression. Leaders are not born of methods like that.

When faith is strong among them, it is remarkably strong. But it is a different sort of faith from that which characterized a generation ago. Perhaps it is better to say that it is faith with a different fundamental angle. Many of the generation once removed were trained by the "I-say-it-and-it's-true" school of teachers. Authority was emphasized for us and stressed with all the vigor

it could stand. The faith of the young man and woman today has more of reasoning in it. Their courses in school and college each year are coming to stress the reasonableness of faith, the arguments back of faith, the apologetics on which acceptance of God's Word rests.

And because they have seen the arguments of the other side, perhaps unwillingly, possibly even unconsciously, their faith has a maturity which is deep and firm. It is quite true that many of them slip through their religion courses and fail to grasp the essential points. Still, the fact that they know there are such points, have been exposed to arguments which have not always taken, gives them something of intellectual conviction.

Fundamental generosity, a spirit of real initiative, faith seasoned, matured, and reasoned, may seem a strange grouping of good qualities. They go together, however, in splendid fashion into the whole cause of Catholic Action for which we are hopefully preparing the younger generation. In that cause they have unselfishness enough to take a difficult part; they have initiative enough to lead where leadership is needed; they have a reasoned faith to make them willing to accept the guidance and direction of those who in the Catholic Church stand to them in place of Jesus Christ.

Confession of Faith

DOROTHY DAY

TERESA was talking about a friend of ours who did not believe in God. Teresa is six and a half. "He does not believe in God!" she ruminated. "Perhaps he has forgotten."

"Yes, perhaps that is it, maybe he has forgotten."

"I forget many things," she went on. "I forget when I was a little baby. I forget when I was a little baby and couldn't walk and I used to crawl up and down the sands and even crawl into the waves and they would splash me. But you tell me about it, so I know."

"It is easy forgetting things."

"And I believe you, too," she went on. "Why doesn't Jim believe you if you tell him about God?"

"Because he hasn't belief. That's what faith is. I tell you something and you believe it, and that is faith."

"I say 'I Believe in God' in school. But I never saw God. Maybe when Jim sees God he will believe in Him. Why do we believe in Him?" she wanted to know.

"Because the Church tells us to. You know, the Sisters tell you in school and the priest tells you."

"Just like you tell me about when I was a little baby and I believe you. I don't remember either. I love to be Catholic, don't you?" Teresa concluded.

And then after a long while and evidently after a good deal of thought: "But good people will go to Heaven anyway, won't they, Dorothy?" I assured her that I thought they would.

And this calling me by name instead of by "mother" had led to another discussion in the past which I reminded her of. I had said, "When are you going to begin calling me 'mother'?"

"I don't know. I'm used to calling you Dorothy. I'm just used to it."

"But no one will know that I am your mother if you call me by my name."

"But I know it," comfortably.

"How do you know I'm your mother?"

"You told me so. You *are* my mother, I know it."

"But that is faith, too. You might have been somebody else's child left to me to take care of when you were too young to remember and I told you I was your mother."

"But I *know* you are my mother." It was an absolute certainty, but the certainty of faith.

And I thought of those words of St. Augustine:

After that, O Lord, Thou, by little and little, with most gentle and merciful hand, drawing and calming my heart, didst persuade me—taking into consideration what a multiplicity of things which I had never seen, nor was present when they were enacted, like so many things in secular history, and so many accounts of places and cities which I had not seen; so many of friends, so many of physicians, so many now of these men, now of those, which unless we should believe, we should do nothing at all in this life; lastly *with how unalterable an assurance I believed of what parents I was born*, which it would have been impossible for me to know otherwise than by hearsay—taking into consideration all this, Thou persuadest me that not they who believed Thy books (which, with so great authority Thou has established among nearly all nations) but those who believed them not were to be blamed. . . ."

St. Augustine was laying emphasis on belief in the sacred writings because, as he said, "no wranglings of blasphemous questions . . . could once wring the belief from me that Thou art."

Teresa's little conversations may seem very precocious, but circumstances of her life make it inevitable that she think on such questions. Where another child accepts naturally, she accepts, ponders, and understands.

She has a cousin of her own age of whom she is very fond, and there are two older cousins of ten and twelve. These children, though baptized at birth, have had no religious training save some desultory teaching on the part of a grandmother. They take great interest in the fact that Teresa goes to parochial school.

"What do they teach you there?" The oldest child asks. "Just prayers and the Bible?"

"I know how to pray," little Sue proclaims. "I say my prayers every night."

"Yes, you just use them as an excuse to stay up a little longer," her father scoffed at her, "and keep the other children awake."

"When I started to school this year, I told my teacher that my mother and father didn't believe in God, but I did," Sue went on.

Teresa has other friends who are just as defiantly non-believers. Little Rose goes to a modern school—she is nine—and last Christmas some old-fashioned friend said cheerily, if thoughtlessly, "Was Santa Claus good to you, Rose?"

And Rose coldly replied, "I don't believe in Santa Claus. I don't even believe in God."

Her father thought her intelligence exceptional. "I never bring any influence to bear on her," he stated firmly.

"I don't believe in influencing a child. Let them come to their own conclusions."

So Rose has become a Young Pioneer. Her father is an active worker in a Communist organization doing propaganda work, but he never brings any influence to bear on Rose.

"Neither do I with Teresa," I tell him with all seriousness. "I use no persuasion at all. I just put her in a Catholic school. Just as you put Rose in a progressive school. I don't make her say her prayers. She just wants to."

But he doesn't see my point. He really believes that he has had nothing to do with influencing Rose's beliefs.

Another close relative who is much concerned if his wife serves meat on a Friday when I am visiting them, and who will insist on tearing himself away from his comfortable Sunday-morning pursuits to drive me five miles to Mass and to wait outside the church an hour to drive me back, is quite frank about his children. "If I should die," he says, looking darkly at his wife, whose mother is a "new-thought" advocate, "I want my children to receive no religious training whatever. When they go to college, I want them to take a course in comparative religions and the history of religion." With the end in view (he regards the result as inevitable) that they will reject all religion.

"Do you believe in God?"

If you ask this question of a "liberal" he will say he doesn't know. He will usually admit to praying in times of terror—the terror which comes to all when a loved one lies ill. He will be humble about his cowardice and be childlike in a desire to throw himself in reliance upon his Maker. But at the same time, he is bitterly opposed to giving his children religious instruction, regarding religion as an emotional aberration.

"Liberal" women are less unquestioning in their ideas as to religion and their children's education. Questions are always coming up on the children's part and they have no answer.

One friend said doubtfully, "It would be so much easier to bring up a child with religious ideals. Things would be far simpler and matter of fact. Ethics are so abstract."

God and His Mother Mary, St. Joseph and the Little Flower, are not abstractions to Teresa. They are good and loving realities.

"Does religious teaching really help them to be good?" one dear friend, the mother of several children, asked quite simply and sincerely.

I told her how Teresa interrupted her act of contrition at night to say, "I was good today. I didn't do anything. But I'm still sorry for hitting Freddy yesterday." And my friend, harassed by the many problems of behavior among her brood, said doubtfully and somewhat sadly, "I don't know. I wish I knew."

So, with cousins and uncles and aunts and friends, none of them believers, but none of them untouched by the question of the existence of God, it is inevitable that Teresa look, and listen, and ponder.

The Spirit of Modern Germany

GERHARD HIRSCHFELD

ANY article on Germany should begin with an apology: namely, that the German situation is changing so rapidly that one does not know whether a written comment still holds good by the time it is printed. But such apology could justly be applied to a news report only, whereas an article is not identical with reporting the news. While the news, as cabled from day to day, is changing often enough to embarrass politician and journalist alike, the fundamental forces which produce the news are as reliable and as constant as they ever were. What are these fundamental forces?

A popular opinion about Germany likes to play with the idea that the German people, embittered, exploited, and in black and hopeless despair since the days of Versailles, have set themselves grimly to the task of breaking their chains. Militarism, they say about Germany, is marching again. Heel clicking and goose stepping are again in high favor, from the Hugenberg Steel Helmets down to the Fascists and Communists. Even the democratic white-collar workers and the social-democratic workers have their flags and banners and battle formations. Think of the numerous athletic clubs, of General von Schleicher's demand to arm, of the military parades and demonstrations, of the predominance of the old generals, not to forget the Hohenzollerns who are back in the favor of the Fatherland.

It all fits very nicely into the picture of a Germany intent upon bloody revenge. Soon the battalions will be marching, the flags will be flying, the cannons firing, and the people going wild in the fever of war.

This may happen, or it may not. But if it happens, it will not be because of the fetish of the uniform, or of the splendor of the military display. And if it happens, the responsible spirit would not come from the Wilhelmstrasse in Berlin so much as from the mirrored halls of Versailles. Yes, this would be the reaction to the spirit that made possible the Treaty of Versailles.

However, as far as Germany is concerned, there is a different sort of spirit; that of Weimar, which does not merely include Goethe and Eckermann, but which, in a sense, refers to Kant and Bach and Beethoven and Schopenhauer. Theirs was never a "uniformed" effort; they never had anything to do with militarism and the militaristic spirit. Yet, knowing the average German, it is by no means an exaggeration to say that their spirit has been and is as typical of the average German as any uniform has ever been.

Obviously, if there is on one side the spirit of the uniform representative of the German people, and on the other side the spirit of its poets and philosophers and composers just as typical, there must be a connection between the two, between this spirit of Weimar and that of Versailles.

There is such connection. We only need go back to Kant to find the magic word which is responsible for these

two apparent extremes. In his Categorical Imperative, he says in effect: "act so that the maxim of your will can stand as the principle of a system of laws," and this has become the guiding motive and force in the workings of the German mind. From this principle he derives *logic*; from this he derives the *Gemeinschaftswille*, which means the will of the commonweal, justified by the interest of the body politic, but at the sacrifice of the individual.

This sounds like a conception as we have seen it work in Great Britain more than a year ago, when the people did not bother about parties but elected a national government. In Germany, the political attitude of the individual is different, though. To the German voter it is not the State which counts, but the idea of that State. The German mind has it all worked out in theory. This theory is embodied in the statutes and platforms of the respective parties. And the parties are fighting each other tooth and nail. If one looks through the enormous amount of political literature, one cannot fail to be impressed by the effort on the part of the various parties *not* to strive so much for the realization and practical application of the various doctrines about the State, but to prove the right and the justification of a particular theory exclusively.

That effort is typically German; it has its origin in the doctrine of its philosophers and thinkers. The effort calls for the strictest sort of discipline, of obedience, of subordination—but not to the State and the Government; rather to the idea of the State for which stands the party. This stubborn insistence on logic and the exclusive doctrine (they call it the absolute State) carries in its wake, quite naturally, a good amount of intolerance and "unconditional" demands. The only thing which is typical of all the parties is the law of blind obedience which finds its best and most effective expression in the drill formula, in heel clicking and goose stepping. Here we have the reason for so-called German militarism.

The German people demands from its leaders, first, faith in the "absolute" State, and, second, the military formula as the true expression of this faith. This can be checked up in the fifty years of history of the German Reich. Bismarck, for instance, knew expertly both the popularity of the drill and the common man's idea of the State. He solved the puzzle in a simple manner: he certainly gave them the barracks and parades; but he also gave them a nation so powerful at home and abroad that any party which had any national ambition at all fell gladly into line; the Socialists remained outside, but then they had international aims. That Bismarck gave them both shows his statesmanship; that he actually realized part of the great German dream shows that he was not a typical German. For the typical German is not a realist; he is not inclined to compromise. And he is not practical, because his doctrine is abstract as well as absolute, just as his thinkers are.

Hindenburg is so popular because he is a truly military

figure and so representative of this drill formula; and he is a fine symbol of this super-State for which the German mind is striving. Bruening had to go, in the last analysis, because he was a realist. Neither did he believe in the drill formula, nor did he defend the absolute State. He simply was working for the common-sense State; and even that proved too much. Stresemann expressed his faith in the Weimar Constitution, but still more did he believe in that other Weimar spirit, that of Goethe and Schiller and Eckermann. Perhaps he was a mystic. If so, he was just the right man for Germany.

This doctrine, then, and its expression in military fashion, are the forces which are responsible for the post-War events in Germany. The people, back in 1918, had a wonderful chance to realize its dream. Its kings and princes, even the Kaiser, ran away from them. They were left to their own resources, and they did not hesitate to build their State. They elected their own President; they made their own Constitution; they changed their flag; they organized a little police army; they had even their own Reichstag. It may be remembered that in the first Reichstag of the Republic, the middle classes had not less than eighty per cent of all the seats. Today they have less than forty per cent.

The people, and with them the Republic, lost their opportunity. The first thing they did was to split. There was never any sort of national endeavor, let alone a national Government. The political parties split, thereby increasing their number. The Conservatives who had ruled the country under the monarchy for forty-five years were left alone, and they soon broke into the Reichstag, into the police army, into the Government.

The people have failed because they were unable to forget their two inherent aims, which, in reality, are only one: the aim for the absolute State, and its due military expression. The parties are still fighting for it, and are still without success. In the vain effort of the parties, the monarchy is marching and gaining ground. The monarchy contains these two outstanding ingredients. It gives the average German his absolute State, and it is careful to give him his flags and goose-stepping battalions.

Today, General Kurt von Schleicher rules the country. He is the typical representative of the drill formula as well as of the super-State. He is a Junker of the military caste. Entering the cadet school at the age of twelve, he became Lieutenant in the fashionable Third Guard Regiment at Berlin when he was eighteen, under Von Hindenburg. When, later on, Von Schleicher advanced to the rank of Captain, Hindenburg's son served under him. From that time dates the intimacy between the three which has held fast to this day. After serving in a subordinate capacity on the German General Staff, Von Schleicher organized the Republican police army of 100,000, at the head of which he has been ever since.

Now, as Chancellor, he has not only this little army but also the Prussian police of 150,000. Besides, President von Hindenburg is behind him, and so are the Hohenzollerns (with one or two exceptions), also heavy industry, the Junkers, and, last but not least, high finance.

The people by and large are probably for Schleicher. It would not be surprising if the people, after a more or less vain struggle of fourteen years, would like to go back to their books and theories and studies where they can continue the pro and con of the ideal State—on paper.

The one question mark in the present situation of Germany is Hitler, who clings to his doctrine of Fascism and pure-race consciousness as stubbornly as any native German ever did. He has time and again refused to compromise. In consequence, his movement is apparently subsiding. For this doctrine he may sacrifice both career and party. If he would compromise, he would not be a German but a statesman.

In the picture of Germany, if we want to see it in its true light, we must get rid of these illusions: that militarism is a policy, that misery and despair produced a united front, that the people are political minded, that the Republic is on a firm footing, and, finally, that Von Schleicher is a protector of either the Republic or democracy.

With Scrip and Staff

FATHER JUDE turned up with the New Year. "I rather observed," said he, as he removed his galoshes and hung them upon my new coatrack, "the effects of that deathly chill that you prophesied a couple of weeks ago might affect the New Year's number of AMERICA. There was some keening as the Old Year went out, not only in your pages, but in most of the reflections the press has made on the year's turn. But your furnace is working quite nicely now, is it not?"

"Ideally," I replied, "probably too good to last. But as long as it is piping away today, sit down and give me the news."

"Do you know," said Jude, as he picked up the January number of the *Ecclesiastical Review*, "that this man has hit upon one important method of stopping the leakage in the Church, that we are all so concerned about?"

"What 'man' are you referring to?" I inquired.

"The Rev. John A. Barrett, of the Redemptorist Fathers," said Jude. "You would know more, Pilgrim, of what the Redemptorist Fathers are doing and have done, if you were to read the account of their bicentennial in the December issue of *Thought*. Father Barrett has a good suggestion."

"You mean about the children's missions?"

"Precisely. He thinks it is not enough merely to give some preliminary exercises for the children before the mission for the adults. Read what he says at the bottom of page 28."

Obedient Father Jude, as I usually find it prudent to do, I read as follows:

Suppose the children be taken for a full week before the parish mission. The pastor or his assistants could visit the neighboring public schools and make some arrangements for the dismissal of the children in time to attend the mission. He could rely on the zeal and kindness of the Catholic teachers, to see that the Catholic

children came to the church at the appointed hour. Constant insistence that all the Catholic children attend the mission would bring results by the end of the week, and most, if not all the children of the parish would be reached.

"Father Barrett goes into detail," continued Jude, "in order to show how his plan can be carried out. Did *you* ever give a children's mission?"

"I have, several of them," I answered with pride, "and I never had a better time."

"You taught them catechism?"

"In the sense that I didn't presume too much knowledge, but quietly worked in some simple explanations. With the children, you can start from the idea of sanctifying grace. Father Cornelius Shyne, S.J., is strong for that plan, and it is amazing how simply and attractively it works out. Pictures, charts, hymns, various activities and exercises, can liven things up, which would be out of place for adults. And all those aids now are so easy to obtain, as compared with a few years ago."

"Well, at any rate," said Jude, "you don't have to do such a terrible lot of repairing and SOS'ing as with the grown-ups. With the children you can spend more time on the constructive side of things."

AS usual, however, Father Jude had certain difficulties to propound. "There is the question," he said, "as to whether there will be, after a little while, any children to give missions to. Now take Professor Ogburn, of the University of Chicago . . ."

"What has he to do with it?"

"Only that he is a scientist, who has a well-founded reputation for accuracy. Looking over the United States census for 1930, Mr. Ogburn discovers that the American family is a pretty small affair, and tells the scientists about it at Atlantic City. There are three family groups, he points out, that may be called family. One is the family in the strict sense, which consists only of husbands, wives, parents, and children. The second is that of the foregoing, plus blood relatives. This may be called the kinship family, or, as they say in the South, just 'kin.' The third group is the kinship family plus boarders, roomers, lodgers, and servants living in. This may be called the household."

"That would make about a dozen, wouldn't it?"

"Not according to the census. The average household is four (4.01) persons. By subtracting and dividing, we find that the average kinship family is 3.82 persons. But sample studies, says Mr. Ogburn, reveal that one out of every three families has a relative living with them, in other words, .3 of a relative to a family. So that 'the average-sized family, omitting boarders, lodgers, servants, and relatives, consists of 3.5 persons in 1930 living at home in the family.' And since Daddy and Mamma make two out of this, we have something like a child and half (1.5) to each family. Or, as Mr. Ogburn puts it, two out of every five families have no children at all."

"And yet there must be an average of more than three children if the race is to carry on."

"Which is what I meant that I wonder where the chil-

dren for the children's missions are all going to come from."

"There are some other items worth noting also," continued Jude. "For instance, we find that the so-called urban families, that is, from places of 2,500 population or larger, are some twenty per cent less numerous than the rural families. The larger the town, the smaller the family, as a rule. Then, the smallest families, on an average, are found on the Pacific Coast; the largest are in the South Atlantic States. The average size of the Negro family, 3.15, is smaller than that of the native white of native parents, 3.37.

"As for the breadwinners, in the 'urban' families, one in every three had more than one member bringing in money to the family. In our urban communities now one in every five families (20.2 per cent) lives in an apartment or flat. One-half of American families (51.2 per cent) live in rented homes."

"What conclusion do you draw from all that?" I asked.

"None at all, except that unless we educate our children with a sturdy faith the world will find itself dying out. You know what Will Cuppy says: 'You can train Flamingoes but after you have spent years training one all you have is a trained Flamingo.' Our young people must grow into something more than trained flamingoes if they are to keep the world alive."

IN the *Journal of Religious Instruction*, published by DePaul University, for December, 1932, Dr. Ellamay Horan gives the results of some researches that she has made into the motives of school children for attending Mass. They have significance in the light of Father Jude's remarks, and are suggestive for teachers and shapers of curricula.

In the Spring of 1932, 567 boys and girls, of "three very fine schools in Chicago," were given to read a simple situation where a boy staying with a non-Catholic friend of his mother refused to go fishing with some other boys, and went to Mass. The question was asked (followed on the question sheet by three blank lines): "What are three reasons, any one or all of which, might have helped this boy to remain firm to his purpose not to miss Mass on Sunday?"

In the answers, by far the greatest number assigned the element of sin and possible punishment involved as a reason why the boy resisted temptation.

The following table presents, with certain limitations, a summary of Miss Horan's findings as to the reasons most frequently given for the boy's fidelity to Sunday Mass (there are a considerable number of scattering, miscellaneous reasons):

Rank	Reasons	Frequency
1.	It would be a mortal sin to miss Mass on Sunday....	250
2.	It would be a sin.....	134
3.	He was a good or strong Catholic.....	122
4.	He loved God.....	83
5.	He wanted to receive Holy Communion.....	43
6.	Tom wanted to give a good example to the other boys	39
7.	He had been taught to go to Mass on Sunday.....	34
8.	His mother told him to go to Mass.....	33

9. He did not want to miss Mass.....	31
10. He wanted to receive God's grace.....	29
11. It was the right thing to do.....	27
12. Something might happen if he did not go.....	26
13. To show he was a good Catholic.....	25
14.5 He had a strong will.....	24
14.5 It was his duty to go to Mass.....	24
16.5 He never missed Mass.....	23
16.5 He would be offending God to miss Mass.....	23

Some of her findings are as follows (*italics mine*):

1. Pupils seem to put great stress on the element of sin involved in giving a reason for the boy's behavior.

2. *There is almost a total lack of interest in the sacrificial character of the Mass.*

3. Pupils manifested no interest in the ceremonies of the Mass.

4. A comparatively small per cent showed an interest in giving good example.

And she asks, among other things:

Are the experiences of pupils in attending Mass conducive to make them love it? Or is it possible that long sermons that they do not understand and an extraordinarily long period of Communion distribution have been conducive to lessen their interest in the Holy Sacrifice?

Do pupils look upon the study of the Mass in the classroom as a school lesson to be learned and terminated therein?

Why is it that not a single pupil manifested interest in the ceremonies of the Mass?

On what topics and learning activities should the school place emphasis in developing its instructional program on the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass?

The January issue of the *Journal* contains further studies along these lines. Unless I am much mistaken, Miss Horan is going to make many interesting discoveries before she finishes her inquiries. THE PILGRIM.

Sociology

The Share-the-Work Plan

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

WHEN the house catches fire, wise and sober men have been known to toss the china out of the window, and then remove the pots and pans from the kitchen with meticulous care. Last September I wrote that the job-sharing plan was just another one of those things that we do before the firemen come to assume charge of the premises. Nothing more would be heard of it, I wrote, after a couple of months; but that was merely another mistake of mine. The firemen have arrived and, in the person of Walter C. Teagle, have hurled the last teacup crashing to the street. They think the plan a good one, on the theory, possibly, that any sort of energy is better than lethargy.

Perhaps they are right, but after reading Mr. Teagle's apologia in the New York *Herald Tribune* for January 1, I still find myself on the mourners' bench, remote from a conviction of sin. I wrote at the time referred to that, as far as I could judge, the job-sharing plan was the best scheme yet excogitated for shifting the burden from the broad shoulders of the rich to the bowed and narrow shoulders of the poor. Nothing that Mr. Teagle alleges seems to meet that criticism. Some of the items which he omits strengthen it.

I am well aware, of course, that the job-sharing plan is growing. Nothing that can be proposed now is likely to check it. Something can be urged in its favor, just as something can be said in favor of hitting an intoxicated man on the head with a chair (in lack of other restraints) when, in all good humor, he proposes to jump out of a tenth-story window. But physicians, and even laymen, can indicate a method less objectionable in itself, and better fitted to attain the end desired. It seems to me that the contrivers of the job-sharing plan begin with the chair, and then sit down to work out a philosophy to prove that it is the only way of keeping labor from jumping to destruction.

I think that Mr. Teagle has said about all that can be presented in favor of the plan. He has said it skilfully, too, for the first three columns of his article left me with the impression that unemployment was rapidly becoming a forgotten phenomenon.

The index of employment shows a steady rise. Men and women are going back to work. . . . There had been upturns before that lasted a few weeks, and then collapsed into the downward curve with which every previous year of the depression has ended. But not so 1932. The upturn continued, the number of people employed has steadily mounted.

And so on. This impression is deepened by the elaborate data collected by Mr. Teagle from many cities. News of this kind is so very pleasant that the reader may overlook, as I did, the euphemistic and euphonious qualifications which Mr. Teagle slips into the text at appropriate corners.

Men, or some of them, are going back to work. That is true. Perhaps they can be numbered by thousands. But the other side of the picture is not turned to us.

For every man who goes back to work, another man has his wage cut in half. The thousands brought back on half-pay are balanced by the thousands who up to last week managed to scrape through on twenty-five or thirty dollars a week. Today, their wage is twelve-fifty or fifteen.

We need no further proof that the job-sharing plan is substantially a wage-cutting plan. The employer pays no more. But every employe gets less. Look here upon this picture, advises Hamlet, and on that.

The job-sharing plan may be necessary in this terrible emergency. It may be the only means at hand to stave off starvation from millions. On that ground, but on no other, it could be tolerated. But is it in fact the only means? Have all other remedies and devices been tried and found wanting? Has Congress gone to the limits of its constitutional authority in seeking ways and means to provide employment? Have the State legislatures exhausted their resources? The questions provoke a bitter smile.

The simple truth is that job sharing, if necessary, is necessary only because it is the only device that employers are willing to accept. It distributes, as Mr. Teagle points out, purchasing power. It cannot actually raise that power, but it probably will stimulate trade. Finally, it costs employers nothing. Why should they not be willing to approve it, to the number of over 5,000 firms and corpora-

tions? It's money in their pockets. It's certainly money out of the pockets of employees hardly able to keep their families in decency even under the old wage scale.

Congress has failed in its duty, and the legislatures have failed. What of the corporations? Are all so hard pressed that the job-sharing plan alone stands between them and bankruptcy?

In the current *The World Tomorrow* Paul H. Douglas, of the University of Chicago, gives some comparisons that should be consulted in any study of the plan. Using figures supplied by the Federal Bureau of Labor Statistics, Mr. Douglas calculates the total amounts paid out in wages by manufacturing industries since 1926. For that year, he chooses 100 as the index figure.

1926	100
1927	97
1928	95
1929	100
1930	80
1931	60
1932 (until September).....	38

Compared with 1926, the year 1932 brought the worker a wage reduced by about sixty-two per cent. It is true that the cost of living has also decreased, but only by about twenty per cent since 1929. Thus the purchasing power, or real value, of the 1932 wage is only about half that of the 1929 wage. Going beyond the workers in factories, Mr. Douglas calculates that the total income of all workers in the seventeen classified wage-earning groups, is not more than forty-five per cent of what it was in 1929.

But what of the "fellow-sufferers" of the workers, the men and women who derive all or part of their income from coupons and dividend checks? Mr. Douglas has not forgotten them, but has compiled a table of figures on interest and dividends from data supplied by the Standard Statistics Co. for the same years. One hundred is the index figure for 1926.

1926	100
1927	129
1928	137
1929	173
1930	196
1931	187
1932 (est.)	160

These statistics indicate that although wages are about sixty-two per cent below 1926, the total disbursements for dividends and interest are still about sixty per cent above those paid in 1926. Since, moreover, the cost of living has declined, these fellow-sufferers of the worker are deriving more income than in 1926.

The first charge on an industry should be a decent wage for the employee. Hence retrenchment on dividends and interest should precede wage cutting and—what is the same thing—job sharing. Has that order been followed? Apparently not.

Critics of the job-sharing plan have been compared to those bitter-enders who would rather starve than take half a loaf. That is an unfair comparison. The position of the critics is that if the corporations cut out the out-

rageously high salaries of executives and experts, the bonuses which sometimes exceed the salaries, the practice of lending money to wild-cat speculators without investigation or demand for security, and the habit of playing the stock market, they should be able, even now, to give every worker three-quarters of a loaf, if not a whole one. We do not object to the half-loaf offered by employers, but to their holding back the other half or fourth.

Education

The Teaching Brothers in Our Schools

PETER J. BERNARDING

IN his very interesting article, "The Teaching Brothers" (*AMERICA*, December 3, 1932), John Wiltbye has put his finger on a fundamental weakness in our educational system, the over-feminization of our schools. Thereupon, he proceeds quite logically to make a strong appeal for more Brothers to teach the boys of our higher grades. Neither idea, it is true, is strikingly novel, yet both ideas need very much to be emphasized. Mr. Wiltbye presents the first thought largely from a personal standpoint; the second from the layman's point of view. Permit me to add emphasis to his arguments by presenting the first on a national scale, and giving the priest's slant on the second.

What is the percentage of men at present engaged in the public elementary schools of the country, and how does it compare with the past? To answer this question it will, of course, be necessary to quote a few statistics. In the "Statistical Survey of the United States," we find that in 1928 there were 69,455 men as against 573,257 women, or, in percentages, 10.8 against 89.2. Taking a glance into the past, we find that as late as 1890 there were 121,877 men in the public elementary schools, a percentage of 34.3. These figures reveal not only a situation, but a very decided trend to place primary education almost entirely in the hands of women.

Is the situation different in our own parish schools? Mr. Wiltbye, judging from conditions in the diocese of Brooklyn, seems to think that our percentage, for city schools at least, is better than that of the public schools. "The Catholic school," says he, "in which the Brothers have charge of the eighth grade, and of the sixth and seventh as well, is not uncommon." This is perhaps true of Brooklyn, for the current report of the diocesan superintendent of schools gives the number of Brothers at work in the elementary schools there as eighty-five. It is not true of my own diocese of Pittsburgh, however, where there are only eleven Brothers in the 228 parish schools; and these are engaged in but two schools. What of the rest of the country?

There are but few dioceses in the country where the situation is different. According to a chart, prepared by Brother Ambrose, C.F.X., and published in the annual report of the National Educational Association for 1929, there were forty-seven dioceses entirely without teaching Brothers. The number in which there are no Brothers in

the elementary schools must be considerably larger, since the great majority of our Brothers are now engaged in Catholic high schools and colleges.

But what is the number of Brothers teaching in our Catholic elementary schools in the country at large? The statistical survey of Catholic schools (1926) conducted by the N. C. W. C. reported 927 men (which practically means Brothers) out of a total of 50,931 teachers in our elementary schools. This would give us a percentage of only 1.8 as against the 10.8 of the public elementary schools. This, of course, does not include the number of parish priests who conduct classes in Christian doctrine, Church history and bible history. Though most priests are interested in the boys of their school, their contact with them is necessarily limited by a multiplicity of other duties. It is safe to conclude, therefore, that if we have any advantage in this regard over the public schools, it is in the secondary rather than in the elementary schools, though, in view of the statistical survey, I have good reason to doubt even this.

Such, then, is the present situation. And I may as well confess, that though I fully expected to find our elementary education unduly in the hands of women, I was not prepared to find so complete a surrender as this. It seems quite plain that if the present tendency continues, the day is not far distant when a man in the classroom of our elementary schools will be a *rara avis* indeed. That it is desirable—in a restricted sense, even necessary—to have men to educate the boys of our upper grades, scarcely needs proof. Male teachers are needed in the school, just as a father is needed in the home, of which the school is but an extension.

It has been too generally assumed, I think, that the main cause for lack of vocations to the teaching Brotherhoods is the failure of priests to put this vocation squarely before our Catholic boys, or the lack of sympathy and encouragement on their part where such a vocation manifests itself. It is probably true that priests have shown themselves much more zealous in recruiting their own ranks than in filling up those of the Brotherhoods. In certain individual cases, undue influence may even have been exerted by priests to direct the aspirations of a boy from a Brotherhood to the priesthood. But this was due not so much to any opposition to the former vocation, as to the conviction that the need for priests was the greater and more essential of the two. It is my firm conviction that only the Brothers themselves can put their special vocation adequately before the minds of our Catholic youth. I have known priests who have consistently spoken on the teaching Brotherhoods over a number of years, and yet have never succeeded in gaining a single vocation for them. This may be nothing more than a sad reflection on their oratorical powers; but I think it proves something more. It shows that the Brothers themselves must establish contact with our boys, and speak to them of their life and work. Boys cannot desire or aspire after what they do not know. In spite of many adverse influences, our young people are still susceptible to religious ideals. But these ideals must be presented to them in con-

crete form. They must see their ideals embodied in the life of some person whom they love and revere.

This is a fact which our teaching Brothers seem to have overlooked. At least, they have not made the most of their opportunities to establish contact with our Catholic boys, and to present their own case. They have left it to others to speak for them. They have been zealous indeed in fostering vocations in their own schools. Ninety per cent of all their vocations are from this source. But they have been content to stop there. They have not reached out to other schools, and sought occasion to gather vocations among the boys. A priest, however eloquent he may be, can speak of the Brothers' life only from without, and all the while the fact that he has chosen a different vocation for himself speaks louder than his words. One talk from a Brother will probably go farther to make that life real and attractive for our boys than a dozen from the priest. For the Brother knows from inner experience the joy and the spiritual profit of this consecrated service.

By way of meeting the Brother problem in a practical way, my suggestion would be that each teaching Brotherhood in the United States appoint one or more of its members with oratorical abilities and an appealing personality, to plead their cause in places where the Brothers are not yet established. The plan I have in mind has been followed for some years by one of our foreign mission societies. At some time during the year, one of the priests, with the permission of the pastor, visits the schools and speaks to the boys of the seventh and eighth grades. He describes the life of the missionary in the fields afar and the various activities at their preparatory school. After the talk he takes the names and addresses of the boys who respond to his appeal and has a personal chat with each of them. From then till the end of the school year, he keeps in touch with them by letter and printed matter. The result has been a steady and growing stream of vocations for the Society, and, as a by-product, wider interest in their work. Neglect of these recruiting activities for even one year has resulted in a notable decline in the number of applicants, thus proving the efficacy of the plan.

Nor is the method here outlined entirely new as applied to the teaching Brotherhoods. At the Catholic Educational Convention in 1921, Brother George Sauer, S.M., reported that in the previous year a recruitant committee, with headquarters at Dayton, had been organized with a view to more systematic efforts to get candidates. New as the venture then was, Brother Sauer was able to say that "the Committee's work has been blessed and its sphere of action will be enlarged in the future." In cities, where the Brothers are already established in one or more of the schools, some of them might seek occasion for reaching the boys of other schools by obtaining leave to address at their Sunday meetings such boys' organizations as the Junior Holy Name Society, the Cadets or Boy Scouts.

Something might be done also to put the thought of the Brother's vocation before the boys who are annually turned away from the preparatory seminary in some of

our large dioceses, because there is neither room nor need for them. Out in Chicago, to cite only one such case, there were this year 800 applicants for the first year in the preparatory seminary, of which number only 250 could be taken. Assuredly, here is excellent material to work upon. If the Brothers' life and work were convincingly described to a group of boys like this, not a few of them might be gained for the teaching Brotherhoods. As it is, they are simply left to drift into some form of secular life. Here is one splendid opportunity for recruiting wasted.

It goes without saying that the parish priest must cooperate with the Brothers in the prosecution of such a plan. He might prepare the way by one or several talks on the advantages of the Religious life in general and that of the teaching Brothers in particular. After the Brother's address to the boys, he can be of further assistance by encouraging the boys who have given in their names and by helping them to obviate any obstacles that may arise. He may have to remove parental objections and find a solution for the financial and various other aspects of the undertaking.

As things stand today, it will take a growth of the Brotherhoods little short of phenomenal to give us even a fair prospect of increasing their numbers in the upper grades of our elementary schools within the next generation. For such growth as they have enjoyed in recent years has been more than absorbed by our rapidly expanding system of high schools. Even so, many of these are either understaffed, or else have a large proportion of lay instructors. The Central Catholic High School of Pittsburgh has twenty-one secular teachers to eighteen Brothers. A similar condition prevails in a number of other Catholic high schools.

All the more reason, then, for setting ourselves energetically to the task of winning candidates for the teaching Brotherhoods. The plan of action, herein briefly sketched, if followed consistently and on such a nationwide scale, will, I am confident, bring about the desired result. Other problems, chiefly financial, will have to be solved in the pursuance of our purpose. But the first step is to get the candidates. In this initial work, Brothers, priests and people must labor hand in hand. The question is: will we do so?

FRAGMENTARY—YOUR GARDEN

I have not ever seen your garden though
 I well surmise the February wonder
 By which your hyacinth and crocus sunder
 Earth and themselves in patterns that they know.
 I guess your tulip's flame, your jonquil's glow,
 That dear half miracle, half velvet blunder
 You call a pansy, and the golden plunder
 The acacia shares with all the winds that blow.

But wherefore do I send this message? Pardon
 My having thus much courage to begin it,
 Who must not ever wander through your Arden
 To pluck its rose or listen to its linnet,
 Knowing how life has grown your braver garden
 For love that has and has not blossomed in it.

SISTER M. MADEIRA.

Back of Business

THE past year stands out among the years of depression in one respect. It did not bring us anything like a solution of current problems, but it did a great deal to analyze these problems. It disillusioned public opinion with regard to what is, and what should or could be done. At least in this respect, 1932 may at some future time be considered as having hit the "psychological" bottom of the depression. By now, most of us have rid ourselves from illusions which were responsible for 1929. Enlightened minds, I believe, have definitely turned from production as the panacea for all ills.

The emphasis on "technocracy" may be exaggerated, but it nevertheless serves to turn our minds to the danger of a production monopoly and to the significance of the consumer alike. There is, furthermore, the report just published on "Recent Social Changes," which makes a convincing case for better distribution of income. The economic problem of unemployment, not to be confused with the social need for relief, has opened many eyes to the fact that our production system is inadequate if it cannot produce work for all.

All these forces have worked and are working hand in hand for better conditions, to bring back, in the end, prosperity. Unhappily, it does not mean that their victory is merely a matter of time. It is probably true that this depression has been successful in converting the popular attitude to saner and sounder principles of production, consumption, and distribution. And now, they logically conclude, the greatest obstacle has been overcome. Now that we know what is wrong, let's get rid of it.

This is not quite so. Those who have been converted—the teacher and the lawyer, the workingman and the clerk, the professional and the lecturer, the author and the merchant—have little to say about the course of finance and industry. True enough, the problems ahead of us are no longer a matter of theory. True enough, very practical, very real, and very earnest measures are required. They call for sacrifices, not from the teachers, the clerks, and the lecturers, but from those in whose hands lies this task of applying a changed conception to production and income distribution: finance and large-scale industry.

They are responsible for our economic system. And they are not convinced. They are not cutting production because they sense a new era of controlled production but because they have to balance income with outgo. They (as a rule) make no sacrifices in an attempt to support the spending power of the population but cut employment and wages right and left. In many cases they are forced to.

At any rate, before this changed conception can take practical effect, the industrialists and financiers must be convinced. It is doubtful whether or not harder times are needed to bring about a changed attitude, a new conception on their part.

GERHARD HIRSCHFELD.

Dramatics**Stage Diction, Good and Bad**

ELIZABETH JORDAN

I ENTERED upon this Yuletide carefree and happy, only to be saddened by the discovery that some of the ladies and gentlemen of the stage no longer love me as they did. Their feelings have been hurt by my recent criticisms in AMERICA of their stage diction. Being obviously unable to sit out in front with the audience, and listen to themselves, they are convinced that their diction is excellent. They ask a pregnant question and pause for a reply. Why, they want to know, has no noble newspaper critic found fault with their diction, if it is as bad as I say it is?

There are two answers to this question, and both shall be given. The first is that the daily newspaper critics are very properly assigned the best seats in the theaters—seats to which no reviewer on a weekly publication can hope to aspire. The newspaper critics sit in the third, fourth, or fifth row, as a rule, and if there are any sounds at all proceeding from the stage, they are in a position to hear them.

The second answer is that, even granting this, noble press critics have frequently raised their voices in pained surprise over the imperfect stage diction in the average play. It is not very long ago that the distinguished dramatic critic of the *New York Times* flatly announced, in his appreciative review of the admirable play "Another Language," that the lines spoken by the members of the company could not be heard back of the fifth row. But the majority of the critics, who themselves hear easily and comfortably in their front seats, are probably not conscious of the sufferings of those behind them. If David Belasco were still alive, I would ask him to seat the leading press critics in New York in the twelfth row of his theater, at the dress rehearsal of a new production, and subsequently ask each critic how much he heard of the play.

I am not saying that no critic in the twelfth row would hear any of the play. Such a charge would be absurd. I am simply stating the cold fact that every critic would miss countless words and phrases of the play, and often entire sentences. Almost every theater-goer will agree with this statement. Theater-goers admit the situation and mean over it. But they are a philosophic band, and they have accustomed themselves to hearing two-thirds of a play and guessing at the rest of it. They are not prepared, however, to do this indefinitely. The hundreds of letters I have received from them since my recent broadside in AMERICA, on stage diction, show that they are getting ready to revolt.

Those critics who commented on the broadside, and many of them did, gave their space to quoting the article, with the brief comment that the facts were very much as stated. The editor of the *Stage*, in a page editorial, makes this handsome admission in his November issue: "I should like to have a census taken of a thousand play-

goers, chosen at random, asking them about their aural reception of the last play they saw. I imagine that the poll would abundantly support Miss Jordan's contentions."

Which brings us back to our audiences. I cannot experience much regret over the sorrow caused the players by criticism when I remember the letters from theatergoers which that article brought me. They are pathetic in their gratitude. They make all sorts of constructive suggestions—the one most frequently repeated being that we form a national club of playgoers who will not attend any play where the diction of the players is not clear enough to be heard throughout the theater. I am asked to be the president of such an organization, with AMERICA as its official organ!

The suggestion does not appeal. We reformers are not going in for anything in the nature of boycotting. But I hope and believe that when the ladies and gentlemen of the American stage have lived down their sense of injury and taken in the justice of these criticisms, they will bring their diction up to the high level of their acting. Then we shall have a combination that will put the American stage in a short while ahead of the stage in any other country.

Perhaps this is as good a time as any to bring up another question. I have been asked by a leading player whose diction I criticized, by what right and authority I "assume the position of judge and jury passing on American stage diction."

I think that I know something about stage diction. At least I have seen almost every good play put on in New York during the past twenty-five years, as well as hundreds of bad plays. I have seen the acting of all the most famous players in the world. I have attended the leading theaters of almost every country in Europe. I have a great love for the stage. Next to a fine novel I think a fine play, finely acted, is the most satisfying piece of art there is. I am blatantly proud of the strides made in the acting of American players during the past decade. Most important qualification of all, I happen to have the columns of a widely read and scholarly weekly open to the expression of my opinions. Other than these, an observant eye, and a desire to be just, I have no reason in the world for constituting myself judge and jury on diction or any other subject. But my intention is to hammer away on this question of stage diction, and to enlist all possible aids in the campaign, until any man or woman who pays money to see an American play is reasonably certain to hear the words of that play.

After which preamble we will take up the best and the worst stage diction of the present season.

Let me call attention first of all to a particularly idiotic theory for which I believe stage directors are responsible—the theory that players must drop their voices to a whisper in a big scene. Both players and directors forget that, at the moment when the audience is naturally most anxious to hear every word of the dialogue, the beauty of the player, male or female, is not enough. A slight movement of the lips is not enough. The knowledge that a whis-

pered dialogue is going on between two players, standing or sitting eye to eye in the tensest moment of the drama before us, is not enough. More than anything else in life, at that particular instant, every person in the audience wants to know what those players are saying. The audience has not come to that theater to attend a pantomime. It is there to hear the play as well as to see it. And it is both cruel and dishonest for directors and players to withhold a privilege to which the audience is entitled by every rule of the game.

Every theater-goer is a sufferer from this persistent delusion that big scenes must be inaudible. Yet the delusion can be shattered in a few minutes by one well-written, admirably played and superbly delivered scene in "Criminal at Large," Guthrie McClintic's big success of this season. True, this is a Wallace melodrama, but it is a modern melodrama, played in a modern manner. Its diction throughout is admirable. In its big scene both players, Emlyn Williams and William Harrigan, drop their voices, as they naturally would in the situation shown. But—and here is my point—those low voices are so clear, the diction of the two men is so perfect, that every word they utter is heard throughout the house. Every player in New York who has not yet mastered the art of low but distinct diction (and that means the great majority of our players), should make a pilgrimage to the Forty-eighth Street Theater and listen to that scene. If they must whisper they should learn how to whisper and make their whispered lines audible.

First of all I would urge Miss Judith Anderson and Mr. Montague Love to listen to the scene. They, also, have a big scene in Gilbert Miller's production "The Firebird." They play it face to face across a table—and after the first few sentences the audience might as well take a pleasant nap till the scene is over. Throughout the rest of the play their diction is excellent. On the other hand, a little newcomer in the same play, Elizabeth Young, rising to her high opportunity, sends forth her lines softly but with exquisite clearness. Most fortunately, no director has yet convinced *her* that she must swallow the words of her big scene.

In "Dinner at Eight" Conway Tearle shows that he, too, has escaped that fatal lesson. Throughout the play his diction is admirable, and in his big scene it is still perfect, however his associates mumble. In the same play, in a scene between a doctor and a doomed man, both players—Charles Trowbridge and Austin Fairman—fairly shut their jaws on their words and keep the poor things prisoners; though in real life, when a doctor pronounces a patient's doom, he almost invariably does it clearly and crisply, trying by the vitality of his voice to supply for the patient the bracing quality his words do not hold.

Next to mind comes the special scene in Lee Shubert's production of "Autumn Crocus" in which Francis Lederer is delighting us. Patricia Collinge was playing opposite him when I saw the comedy, and admirably though she acted the big love scene in the hills, her voice was almost inaudible throughout. It was so low that it

probably hypnotized Lederer, and made him key his own voice down to it. His diction, perfect through the rest of the play, became in those moments as inaudible as hers. The two lovers were deciding whether they would part forever or live together in sin. Naturally the audience wanted to hear that discussion. All it learned, however, was that they parted; and it learned that by seeing them go their opposite ways.

An equal strain is briefly endured by the audiences seeing Miss Crothers' charming comedy, "When Ladies Meet." On the whole the diction in this play is very good. I fancy that Miss Crothers, who puts on her own plays, lays considerable stress on the audibility of her lines. But in the strong scene between the wife and the affinity of Walter Manners, Frieda Inescourt and Selena Royle forget all her teaching and drop their voices into their throats. I doubt if, in the most intense moments, they hear each other speak. Certainly few of the spectators back of the first rows of seats can hear them.

In conclusion, and without a moment's hesitation, I must give the palm for word-swallowing this month to Miss Blanche Yurka, as the "First Narrator" in Miss Cornell's new offering "Lucrece," at the Belasco. Of "Lucrece" as a play I shall write later. All I can do here is to express my surprise that any narrator anywhere could narrate so inaudibly at moments. There were other moments when Miss Yurka's voice, loud and clear, ascended to the upper balcony. Those were not the moments when her lines were important. If they ever were, which I greatly doubt, it was when they had to do with some happening on the stage. Then Miss Yurka's lips moved, but no sound came forth. The voice of the "Second Narrator," Robert Loraine, was usually clear, for Mr. Loraine has the faultless diction of the best English school. But there were intervals when Miss Yurka's example was too much for him. He, too, mouthed and mumbled and swallowed. Some day, perhaps, we shall know why the adapter and the producer permitted either of the "Narrators" to encumber the stage in "Lucrece." At present the problem is beyond me. I only know that, notwithstanding the distinction of the artists who were given the roles, those two masked and shrouded figures annoyed the audience.

The diction in Priestley's "Dangerous Corner" is good throughout. It has need to be, as it is a play in which there is little action and the lines are supremely important. Perhaps the satisfying diction is explained by the fact that the characters are all literary men and women. I like to think so, though the theory finds small support in literary circles in real life.

I have already complimented Pauline Lord on her excellent diction in "The Late Christopher Bean," though I have found much fault with her speech in the past. In her supporting cast Ernest Lawford's dry and academic diction is audible to the last rows of the Henry Miller Theater.

And now, having done my worst, I will take all that is coming to me in the form of letters from players who are full of grieved surprise!

REVIEWS

Chaucer. By G. K. CHESTERTON. New York: Farrar and Rinehart. \$2.50.

It is hardly mere coincidence that the subjects of Chesterton's literary studies so often reflect his own personality. Dickens, Browning, Stevenson, Cobbett: there is something curiously Chestertonian about them all, something so broad and vigorous and hearty in their characters and works that the reader senses their affinity to G. K. C., even before the books themselves have confirmed the intuition. Now comes this "Chaucer," probably the most personal, surely the most enthusiastic of them all. The reason is clear. (Here is a subject who combines with the energy, humor, and humanity of the others, the two things that have become the glory and favored theme of this modern interpreter: Catholicism and medievalism.) Naturally the treatment in this study is more polemic than scholarly. The introduction avows the dual purpose of the crusader: to rescue Chaucer from the pedants and from the Lollards. Only the more petty of confirmed Chaucerians will disown this latest champion on the ground that both causes, are more advanced than he thinks. It takes many voices and strong ones to cry down old prejudices and build up new reputations. (Though the father of English poetry is probably more popular today than at any other time, the full measure of his deserved vogue is yet to be reached.) Conceivably the first part of the book under review may make new converts for Chaucer: the sincere, contagious enthusiasm of personal discovery is there, despite the heaviness of undigested materials, in contrast to the smooth pages of Kittredge, Manly, and other scholars too indiscriminately and rather ungratefully disparaged by one who owes them some of the most fruitful premises of his own conclusions. The other, probably the primary point of the study, is most convincingly made. No reader of the last three chapters can rationally cling to the stupid notion, still inculcated in literary handbooks, that there was something suspicious about Chaucer's Catholicism. Some may even revise their musty ideas about the civilization that could produce a philosopher-poet so uniformly sane and cheerful.

A. C. S.

A Half-Day's Ride. By PADRAIC COLUM. New York: Macmillan and Company. \$2.00.

"Estates in Corsica" is Mr. Colum's subtitle. Like Algernon Sidney Potts in Charles Lever's novel, he becomes a candidate for romantic experience, and an unlicensed observer of the philosophic shadows on life's surface. For Mr. Colum prescinds very carefully from substantial things. Not for him the bready puddings of criticism and world reform. His interests are rather the wax museums and the opera of Paris, the selection of a Miss Europe, epic poetry of the sea and the desert, and Plautus and the comic tradition. But what Padraic Colum says is not half so important as how he says it. In more than a majority of cases this would be a rather clumsy apology for an author's lack of penetration. But the real delight of this essayist and poet is his almost exquisite polish and suggestion. In "A Half-Day's Ride" at least, he is a very welcome *hors d'oeuvres* for those who like the quiet understatement which achieves the effect of limpidity. What Colum says of Paris is perfectly true of his book—the nicest thing about it "is the number of perfectly natural things one is always coming upon."

F. X. C.

The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth-Century Philosophers.

By CARL L. BECKER. New Haven: Yale University Press. \$2.00.

This rather attractively bound little volume contains four very interesting, if not truth-inspiring, lectures, delivered during the past year in the School of Law of Yale University. The author prepares an elaborate historical setting in his rather unique attempt to show that the underlying preconceptions of eighteenth-century thought were essentially the same as those of Saint Thomas and Dante. We of the twentieth century, however, are warned not to try to meet the arguments of the Summa on their own

ground, since in the "climate of opinion" that sustains them we could only gasp for breath. We are advised, therefore, neither to assent to them nor to try to refute them, but just ignore them as being hopelessly irrelevant to the times in which we live. The conclusions of modern science, so we are assured, make it quite impossible for us to regard man as a child of God for whom the earth was created as a temporary habitation, but rather force us to regard him as little more than a chance deposit thrown on the surface of the world. There is a great deal about atmosphere and climate in this little book. After reading it, one feels that the Professor is living in a fog.

J. A. L.

Psychiatry and Mental Health. By JOHN RATHBONE OLIVER, M.D., PH.D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$2.75.

In the writing of this book, the well-known author draws upon a long and wide experience, as clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, a physician, and an eminent psychiatrist. The present work covers, at least in outline, the whole field of abnormal psychology and psychiatry in easy and very intelligible fashion; it is intended for "clergymen, seminary students, and social workers—in fact, any persons without definite medical training and experience whose work brings them in touch with the mental illnesses and maladjustments of their fellow men." Dr. Oliver's appeal to religion and morality gives weight to his many helpful suggestions. But even he will have to be read critically in his moral applications; e.g., though, in general, he is strongly opposed to the use of contraceptives, he hesitates to condemn it in all cases (p. 212). Insistence on the alleged fact that all human beings are homoerotic, autoerotic, etc., will leave a false impression on the unwary. His interpretation of scriptural incidents is open to criticism, e.g., the case of Onan (p. 212).

G. H. M.

Rafael Cardinal Merry del Val. By F. A. FORBES. New York: Longmans, Green and Company. \$2.00.

Doubtless the time is not yet ripe for a history of Cardinal del Val; but in the meantime we may well be content with the character sketch which is here offered. Born in London in 1865 of an Irish-Spanish family, and educated in the Jesuit College of St. Michel in Brussels, Merry del Val entered the seminary of Ushaw in 1883. His Belgian school fellows called him *un ange*; the English seminarians called him Merry Devil, with emphasis, of course, on the merry. It was doubtless the combination of natural endowments and supernatural gifts which prompted Pope Leo XIII to break all precedent and to put the young man in the Accademia, and have him ordained at the age of twenty-two. He said his first Mass on January 1, 1888, in the Gesù. "He had always felt an attraction to the Society of Jesus," writes his biographer, "but it was a problem which he left for the future events to solve, whether his vocation lay there, or in the directly pastoral work of an English parish." His work was to be in neither field. At the age of twenty-seven he was appointed a Private Chamberlain, and a life of ecclesiastical routine work was thrust upon him. Thus when the excitement about Anglican reunion occurred in the early 'nineties he was very much needed, and in fact was appointed secretary to the Commission for re-investigating the validity of Anglican Orders. More astonishing still was his appointment as Apostolic Delegate to Canada at the time of the trouble arising in connection with the Manitoba Law abolishing separate schools. But "those who counted on the youth and inexperience of the Delegate knew neither the clarity of his perceptions nor the strength of his personality—nor, perhaps, his power of prayer." It is this last point which stands forth luminously from the pages of this memoir. Very many letters are quoted; yet there is hardly one that does not reveal a life of prayer unknown at the time to those who could discern only the dignity and even coldness of the Cardinal and diplomat. Pius X was elected in August, 1903. In November, the young Monsignor was made Cardinal and Secretary of State. He was thirty-eight. He still wrote familiar and even joking letters to

his friends and relations; but meanwhile he was behind every phase of that policy to "restore all things in Christ" which marks the pontificate of Pius X. He died in February, 1930; but as you can see from the letters here quoted, the greatness of the last fifteen years was not in his public but in his interior life of prayer and apostolic longings. *Da mihi animas, cetera tolle*—Give me souls, and take away the rest—is all that is written on his tomb. G. G. W.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

The American Negro.—How far do actual facts bear out the assertion of some psychologists that the Negroes of the United States are innately inferior to the white people in general intelligence? "The general acceptance of such an assertion would logically cause drastic changes in our social philosophy and immediately affect the lives of the twelve-million Negroes who compose our largest minority group." Clark Foreman, Director for Studies of the Julius Rosenwald Fund, has gone to the heart of this question in his study, "Environmental Factors in Negro Elementary Education" (Norton. \$1.00). The method of determining the degree to which differences in scholastic accomplishment were to be ascribed to the environment, as the principal factor in these differences, was determined by an interesting study of conditions in several widely varying regions of the South. Besides illuminating the principal question, the study sheds considerable light on the general situation of Negro elementary education. The author has broken some new ground.

At a recent event in New Orleans, a Northern Negro orator surprised his mixed audience by denouncing Abraham Lincoln as in reality the enemy of the Negro. This view is emphatically not shared by W. E. Lilly, a Chicago lawyer, who has contributed a "Negro's Life of Lincoln," entitled "Set My People Free" (Farrar and Rinehart. \$2.50), as his judgment on the Emancipator's true attitude. The hesitations that Lincoln displayed in his earlier days, when other befrienders of the slaves were urging him to action, are interpreted by the biographer as due rather to Lincoln's incurable habit of pondering every side of a question, as well as to his natural self-questioning as to what practical results he might achieve. The story, in good narrative style, ends with the beginning of the Presidency. The author's Victorian predilections for Voltaire, Tom Paine, and other champions of the great "Enlightenment" lead him to ascribe more influence to these writers upon the mind of the youthful Lincoln than they seem to have exercised.

One of the phenomena of the racial situation is the readiness of white theorists to "solve" the Negro problem without taking into account the thought given to it by intelligent Negroes. Lawrence W. Neff, for instance, a kind-hearted, religious-minded Southerner, in his booklet, "Race Relations at Close Range" (Banner Press. 60 cents), propounds assertions and plans which a brief discussion with any Negro sociologist would have exploded for him. Rightly rejecting the absurd idea of geographical separation, he propounds, as far as he can seem to propound anything, something almost equally fantastic, that all the Negroes of the South should emigrate to the North, apparently forgetting the desperate attempts that the South made to retain the Negro in the great migration of 1920-21. The assertion, which he seems to regard as pivotal, on page 30, that "the vast preponderance of crime originates among the blacks," is simply untrue. Apart from the quota of original sin which they share with the rest of men, the criminal element in the Negro group is the direct result of the demoralizing environment in which, due to our social institutions, they are forced to live. Given the white man's opportunity, they need fear no comparison.

Booker T. Washington's message is for all time. Many of his most important pronouncements, which are not always those that are most glibly quoted, are more meaningful today than they were thirty or forty years ago when they were first uttered. His unusual experience of men and things, too, lent maturity to his mind, and a peculiar appositeness to his remarks. Students of his ideas will

be aided by "Selected Speeches of Booker T. Washington" (Doubleday, Doran. \$2.00), edited by his son, E. Davidson Washington. Dr. J. H. Dillard contributes an introduction, and several interesting portraits of Dr. Washington are interspersed.

Ascetical.—This new volume of Mother St. Paul's meditations on the Life of Christ, "Vita Christi" (Longmans, Green. \$1.75), covers the first six months of the third year of our Lord's public life. A foreword explains very simply and clearly contemplation as understood by St. Ignatius, whose method is followed in the thirty-three meditations which make up this very attractive volume. The subject matter of the meditations is vividly presented, not as points, but as pictures. Very many Religious to whom daily meditation is at times a real difficulty, will enthusiastically welcome this practically helpful book.

The special idea that prompted the writing of "Ways of Christian Life" (Longmans, Green. \$2.50), by Dom Cuthbert Butler, O.S.B., was to bring out the kind of guidance, of spiritual food, offered by the four old Religious Orders of the Church—Benedictine, Franciscan, Dominican, Carmelite—for good people of the world. An interesting chapter is devoted to each of these four (pp. 1-141). Four supplementary chapters are added on St. Francis de Sales, the liturgical revival, contemplation, and gathering the fragments. Those on St. Francis de Sales and the liturgical movement are particularly good and add much to the interest and value of the volume. The lack of an index is sorely missed. It is a book well worth reading.

Dog Classic.—In Chapter I of "The Bunch Book" (Appleton. \$2.50), by James Douglas, English essayist, the Sealyham is born a dog and in the closing chapter is only one removed from a human being. The author portrays not a circus dog of tricks, but a dog of noble instincts bordering on intelligence. His "character" is not established by mere tribute words but is revealed through incidents of his career—his complex for chewing everything chewable, his bachelorhood, his ills, his prides, and his prejudices. Mr. Douglas writes with the real "Bunch" dozing beside him, one eye alert, one ear quivering. The author's style is delightfully roguish. The whimsical illustrations are by Cecil Aldin. Dog lovers will dispose of this book in one sitting.

Juvenile Adventure.—"Rosalita" (Century. \$2.00), by Lovell Beall Triggs, in gaudy pink and dainty drawings by Weda Yap, is more than a flight of story across the child's mind. Rosalita, pet of a Spanish family living in California a century ago, when Indians and bandits outnumbered padres, is kidnaped while searching for a doll. Yet the story is secondary to the details of setting. The young reader learns a slice of geography, for California along the Pacific is described in scenery and climate; she learns Spanish customs and courtesies, including an Easter fiesta; she is introduced to a vital chapter of history—missionary labors in the Southwest. Mrs. Triggs is a mother so she knows what kind of flourish to give her pen. She writes with dashing vividness. Rosalita is very real. This juvenile will interest younger boys and girls.

Books Received.—This list is published, without recommendation, for the benefit of our readers. Some of the books will be reviewed in later issues.

ANN VICKERS. Sinclair Lewis. \$2.50. Doubleday, Doran.
BACK TO CHRIST. Rev. Jacques Leclercq. \$2.00. Kenedy.
BULFINGTON OF BLUP. THE. H. G. Wells. \$2.50. Macmillan.
CATHOLIC CHURCH IN CONTEMPORARY EUROPE, 1919-1931. THE. Edited by Peter Guilday. \$2.75. Kenedy.
CHRISTIANITY VS. FREEMASONRY. Theo. Dierks. \$1.00. Concordia Publishing Company.
ESSENTIALS OF ELEMENTARY ENGLISH, FIFTH AND SIXTH YEARS. Sisters of St. Dominic. 88 cents each. Schwartz, Kirwin, and Paus.
HIGHER EDUCATION AMONG NEGROES. Edited by Theophilus Elisha McKinney. \$1.00. Johnson C. Smith University.
HIGHWAYMAN IN IRISH HISTORY. THE. Terence O'Hanlon. 3/6. Gill.
IRISH JESUIT DIRECTORY AND YEAR BOOK, 1933. THE. 1/. Irish Messenger.
JOHN MASEFIELD. Gilbert Thomas. \$1.75. Macmillan.
OUTLINE LESSONS ON THE MISSAL AND THE MASS. Rt. Rev. Msgr. John F. Glavin. Sadlier.
RECENT PROSE. John Masefield. \$2.50. Macmillan.

The Shadow Flies. The Road of Desperation. Hot Water. The Egyptian Cross Mystery.

In "The Shadow Flies" (Harper. \$2.50), Rose Macaulay has painted a glowing picture of life in Devonshire and at Cambridge University during the middle of the seventeenth century. In her foreword, the author says "that only a very few of the people in this book are imaginary." The pages swarm with characters famous in English literary history, Herrick, Suckling, Crashaw, Cowley, Milton, and so on; some of them take an active part in the movement of the story. However, the rather patent thinness of the plot seems due to the intention of the writer, more than to her endeavor to make so many historical characters relive in her work. The theme of the novel is the tragic love of Julian Conybeare, a very young girl of scholastic attainment, for John Cleveland, the brilliant poet-tutor of the University. The love theme is slow in getting under way, but is done with great beauty and delicacy of treatment. Aside from the historical aspect of "The Shadow Flies," which will please literary students especially, the story is commendable for its graceful, fluent style, and for the brilliance of its dialogue, where the author has taken pains to reproduce the correct conversational idiom of the time.

If one can overlook several impossible situations, "The Road of Desperation" (Appleton. \$2.00), by Mary Hastings Bradley, may prove an interesting story to fill an idle hour. An old man dies, leaving the disposal of his money to his daughter, real or supposititious, on the condition that she marry his nephew and namesake, Alexander, within a year; otherwise, the fortune will go to another nephew, Nathan. The latter arranges with an impostor, a former childhood playmate of all three, to impersonate Alexander, who years before had vanished from the scene. The scheme is just reaching culmination, with the playing of the wedding march, when Alexander arrives. The reader gasps with dismay at the spoiling of the plot, but gasps prematurely, for the crafty Nathan hits the new arrival over the head with a bottle, and leaves him unconscious on the railroad track to be run over. Of course, the hero arouses in time, and takes the same steamer to Africa as the newly wedded couple. The author of this tale is said to have been a member of Carl Akeley's expedition which was sent by the American Museum of Natural History to obtain gorillas in the Belgian Congo; and she has hunted tigers in Indo-China; therefore she ought to know all about elephant hunts. But the account of one in which the bride and groom and the hero engage without the slightest previous experience will certainly make the reader open his eyes.

Perhaps the best criticism of P. G. Wodehouse's skill is that, with such contrasting characters as a former All-American football player, a Dry Senator who lost a letter to his bootlegger, a lady who found it and wanted an Ambassadorship for her husband in return, the Senator's beautiful daughter and her fiancé (an impoverished "intellectual" writer who imitates animals over the radio), a safe blower, a confidence man, etc., he has written an entertaining story, so plausible that you almost believe such events could happen. "Hot Water" (Doubleday, Doran. \$2.00) is the title. While not so good as some of his former stories, this one stands high, and will add to his already large number of admirers.

Ellery Queen has his troubles with "The Egyptian Cross Mystery" (Stokes. \$2.00). Within six months' time, the bodies of two men are discovered, beheaded and crucified—one a school teacher in a small West Virginia village, the other a wealthy rug importer in New York. Ellery Queen discovers the connection between the two, and then directs the search for the murderer. The plot is well assembled, presenting an intricate problem to the armchair detective. And if he carefully follows the story, sufficient clues are given to enable him to answer the challenge of the author as to "Who is the murderer?" and prove it as well—but it decidedly is not easy. A criticism that should be made is that the murders are unnecessarily gruesome. But perhaps this will not worry the modern reader accustomed to blood-curdling scenes in the modern movies.

Communications

Letters to ensure publication should not, as a rule, exceed 500 words. The editors are not responsible for opinions expressed in this department. No attention will be paid to anonymous communications.

Recognition of Russia

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I was sorry to see in your progressive magazine an editorial containing such reactionary and unsound statements as that on the recognition of Russia in the issue of December 17. Your misconception in this case seems to be based on the belief that diplomatic relations imply mutual approval of the social and political institutions of the governments concerned in such relations. Carried to its ultimate end, such a foreign policy would divide the world into numerous cliques of nations instead of the concert of powers which is the hope of those who are interested in the cause of world peace. Diplomatic relations are in reality a convenience for the nationals of the countries so involved. That we maintain cordial relations with the present Government of Italy does not mean that we approve of a governmental system nearly as divergent from the Christian ideal as that of Soviet Russia. It is only the means whereby commerce between us and Italy is facilitated, and that common understanding, so necessary to the promotion of world peace, is promoted.

Recognition of Soviet Russia will not mean that we are in sympathy with the aims of Bolshevism, any more than the diplomatic relations carried on with Russia by such Catholic nations as Italy, Austria, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and France mean that those countries approve of the present order in Russia. It merely means that we are interested in maintaining peaceful relations with the Soviet Union, and wish to protect and promote our trade with its people. What can a Catholic object to in this?

Berkeley, Cal.

JOHN CONRAD.

[The refusal of the United States to extend recognition to the Union of Russian Socialist Soviet Republics is not based upon mere disapproval of the social and political institutions of another country. As was stated on December 6, 1930, by Secretary Stimson, our Government cannot extend such recognition until the Soviet Government "ceases agitating for the overthrow by force of the United States Government." Our policy of non-recognition is based primarily upon the refusal of the Soviet Union to fulfil one of the two essential conditions required by the traditional policy of our Republic for the establishment of diplomatic relations with any foreign Power: that of ability to fulfil international obligations. Such ability is absent so long as the Government of the Soviet Union is *de facto* identical with the Third International, whose avowed and explicit aim, as officially declared, is "an overthrow by force of the whole existing social order." The identity of the two is a matter of historic record, and the contrary opinion was recently stigmatized as an illusion by Walter Duranty, the Moscow correspondent of the New York Times.—Ed. AMERICA.]

In Praise of Sisterhoods

To the Editor of AMERICA:

About the time that all the neighbors were exclaiming, "Isn't that little Philomena Marsicano just the *darlingest* baby you ever saw!" I was writing papers in praise of our teaching Sisterhoods. Hence I was surprised to learn from a recent AMERICA that Miss Marsicano, now grown to charming womanhood, I am sure, is pointing a menacing finger in my direction, and accusing me of disparaging the teaching Sisterhoods.

After carefully re-reading the offending article, it seems to me that the worst I said of the Sisters is that they are women. I am sorry that this causes Miss Marsicano to get up steam (in a more lady-like manner, of course, than that of Missis Raddle, firmly planted on a purple cauliflower in the Kidderminster carpet), but I am confident that the Sisters will admit the charge. They know, too, as Miss Marsicano apparently does not, that since their several institutes and rules contemplate schools for girls and little boys,

the charge of the older lads is committed to them only because of necessity, and by way of exception.

In spite, then, of Miss Marsicano's remonstrance, I am still of opinion that men can generally do more than women for boys in the upper grades. That opinion, however, neither inferentially nor in fact affirms disparagement of the inestimable value of the teaching Sisterhoods to Catholic education. It merely states the conviction of many educators that we need the influence of men in our elementary schools for much the same reason that we need the influence of a father, as well as of a mother, in the home.

New York.

JOHN WILTBYE.

To the Editor of AMERICA:

As director of vocations for the Brotherhood of the Congregation of Holy Cross I wish to thank you for publishing, and John Wiltbye for writing the wonderful article, "The Teaching Brothers," in the issue of AMERICA for December 3. It is so seldom that an article on the Brothers appears in our leading periodicals that I feel I would be guilty of ingratitude were I to let the occasion pass without thanking those who were responsible for its appearance.

I am convinced that there is one thing that directors of souls still have to learn, and that is that the Master of the vineyard should know better than any other where to place his laborers. If they but realized that, there would be more Brothers to carry on the work divinely entrusted to them: a work which is inferior to none in the Church, for the Brothers are doing that very thing for which Christ died—helping to save souls! And let me add this: the more Brothers we have, the more priests there will be.

May the good God send the Brothers more champions like John Wiltbye!

Watertown, Wis.

BROTHER ERNEST, C.S.C.

Chicago's Youth Organization

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I agree with Albert F. Reardon, in the issue of AMERICA for December 3, that "the lack of organization, especially among the Catholic youth of the United States, certainly has a very decided effect upon their religious life, both public and private." The question was asked, what is the answer to the Holy Father's request for Catholic Action among Catholic youth? I do not hesitate to declare that the answer is fully and practically given and demonstrated in the Catholic Youth Organization of the Archdiocese of Chicago.

The object is to provide for the idle hours of the boys and young men in their own parish centers in close association with their priests and with their branch of the Holy Name Society. The activities follow three main divisions: (1) Scouting; (2) Athletics; (3) Social. In each of these groups the parish is used as a unit of the Organization, developing and operating the various programs and engaging with other parish units in Archdiocesan competition and events arranged by the executive board.

Scouting was the first activity undertaken, all phases of the scouting program having been adopted. At present time there are about 165 scout troops in the Archdiocese. Over 750 adult leaders administer this instructive, religious, and patriotic program to nearly 8,000 boys. All these men are practical Catholics. Each troop has its spiritual director who looks after the boys' advancement in this field as his scoutmaster looks after his advancement in scouting.

In athletics, the organization has reached over 10,000 boys and young men, fifteen to twenty-five years of age. A well designed and comprehensive program of athletic activities, properly supervised, will be no small factor in the attainment of the purpose of the C. Y. O. The purpose is to secure an active participation by the greatest possible number. In the close fought contests the sturdy qualities of self-control, generosity, modesty in victory, and courage in defeat are instilled into the heart of the true athlete.

The social program includes: glee clubs, symphony orchestras,

dramatic leagues, retreats, vacation schools, and later may be added study or information clubs. Thousands are taking part in the social program and much good is being done. The entire personnel of the Organization, totaling over 2,500 is composed of volunteer workers, whose love of youth and devotion to Church and country inspire them to give their time and ability to the work, and without whom success would be impossible.

Albany.

W. H. G.

Fair Play for Our Dead

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Lester M. Hunkele, in a recent letter to AMERICA, takes umbrage at the suggestion of the Anchorite to send Mass stipends in preference to floral tributes on the occasion of a funeral. Knowing, as I do, that Mr. Hunkele is of the household of the Faith, his utterances, on that account, are strange and unwarranted.

Mr. Hunkele seems to view floral offerings and the giving of Mass stipends for the dead in the light of two competitive business concerns. Nothing could be farther from the truth. One is essentially human, the other is consolingly supernatural.

Mr. Hunkele, being associated with the Metropolitan Retail Florists' Association, is naturally interested. But does not his Catholic Faith teach him another lesson? To bank the lifeless corpse with flowers, to strew roses on the grave, what avail is all this in the light of faith? A consolation, perhaps, to the living, as St. Augustine would put it, but of what avail to the dead?

Mr. Hunkele says: "Do not those who give flowers with an intention to perform a corporal work of mercy spiritualize their act?" I wonder under what category of corporal works of mercy the giving of flowers may be listed! According to my old catechism the corporal works of mercy are seven; Mr. Hunkele implies an eighth, to send flowers to the funeral.

With reference to the spiritualization of the act I have my misgivings—at least in many cases. Natural motives and usage so often prompt the giving of flowers as they so often prompt the bestowal of Christmas gifts, which for so many Christians is the sum total of their observance of that holy Feast Day.

And in the light of our Catholic faith one Mass offered up for our departed friends is of infinitely more avail to them than flowers, pompous funerals, or chiseled monuments. The beautiful custom of sending Mass cards and having Mass offered up for our dead, in preference to a bunch of flowers, has come to stay.

Let us pray this custom will grow more and more, even though it may infringe upon the pocketbooks of floral associations.

New York.

CATHOLICUS.

More Deaf-Mute Schools

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The admirable papers of M. E. DuPaul on the retarded child remind us of another class of defective persons whose unfortunate condition deserves our efficient attention as citizens and as Catholics—namely, the deaf-mute.

These people of normal (and frequently superior) intelligence, whose abnormality is due merely to the physical defect of deafness, can with the help of the hearing be useful citizens and exemplary Catholics. Yet it must be confessed that that help is not always what it might be. True, there are excellent State institutions in which the deaf are efficiently helped to avoid becoming burdens to the State. But these schools work only in the physical order. And we know that the body is to be perfected chiefly because it is the temple of the soul. The situation will strike us more forcibly as Catholics if we regard the fact that two out of every three deaf-mutes baptized Catholic eventually lose the Faith. This is in great part due to the fact that so many Catholic deaf-mutes are obliged to receive their education in State institutions where they never learn about their Faith. Besides, the instruction to be gathered from sermons in church is also denied them.

So, we simply must have more Catholic schools for the deaf. The excellence of the present ones emphasizes their fewness.

Woodstock, Md.

JOSEPH I. STOFFEL, S.J.